

Euro Elections



PHONIES SOAK UP THE BRITISH BACKLASH *(FOR THE TIME BEING)*

Leader
article on
page 4

WHAT WE THINK

Who's getting to Blair?

Tony Blair took a tremendous wallop in last month's Euro Elections, and there is no doubt that public dissatisfaction over Europe had a great deal to do with this. We should not get too carried away over this, however. The Prime Minister's stock has been falling steadily over issues ranging over a much more general front. The war in Iraq, and the casualties being incurred in the following occupation, have played their part in this. Government lies over Iraq and so much else have invited public disgust and contempt – not least the lies over immigration, which has forced its way back to the top of the political agenda. Then there is disillusionment over pensions, council taxes, schools, hospitals and transport: just about everything that New Labour touches it reduces to shambles. The disaster in the Euro poll was one just waiting to happen, for a number of reasons.

But does this tide of public anger have any sobering effect on our Tone? It would

seem not! Hardly was the ink dry on the ballot papers which delivered to the Premier a massive vote of no-confidence on Europe than he was over in Brussels at the EU summit meeting as good as signing up to the new Constitution, with just a few crossed 't's and dotted 'i's being argued about – points of detail over which no doubt there will be fresh concessions just as soon as Blair thinks he can get away with them. Common policies in

lished in Westminster, sworn to torpedo his plans for a European super-state.

Tony Blair is a politician. All politicians, virtually without exception, are dedicated to their own career interests, their jobs, their offices and their public standing – over and above any consideration for the good of their country. And Blair certainly is not one of the rare exceptions

For some time now, whether it be on Iraq, immigration or Europe, Mr. Blair has been acting in a way that defies all common sense when seen from this standpoint: the standpoint of what is good for him as Prime Minister and Labour leader. He seems bent on cutting his own political throat.

Which can only lead us to ask again the question we have asked more than once in the past: What is it that has taken hold of Tony Blair to steer him along these self-destructive paths? Is there some strange esoteric power that has control of him and directs him, like a guided missile, towards decisions not only disastrous to Britain but, more pertinently still, disastrous to himself?

Who is getting to Tony? And how – and why?

D-Day: 60 years on

Services of commemoration of those who gave their all in World War II always leave one on the horns of a dilemma. A great deal of heroism was shown by the men who stormed the Normandy beaches, although of course there were cases of cowardice as well. It is necessary to the *amour propre* of every nation that it highlights the first and plays down the second, that it feels good about itself with regard to the record of its soldiery. That holds good for Britons, Americans, Russians, French and – yes – Germans.

Looking at the veterans who attended the 60th anniversary of the invasions last month, one was struck by the thought that, on the whole, they represented the finest of British manhood – a better generation, one is tempted to say, than the ones that have followed them, although the latter contain many admirable exceptions, of whom the liberators of the Falklands were an example.

But that natural respect should not prevent us asking a number of critical questions about D-Day and the larger war of which it was part. Do we still deceive ourselves that the Normandy battles were the decisive ones in that conflict? In fact they were mere side-shows by comparison with the ones fought on the Eastern front, such as at Stalingrad and Kursk. The war was won and lost in the titanic conflict between the forces of Hitler and Stalin. This is not to diminish the men who took part in the D-Day landings, only to achieve some historical perspective.

In addition to this, people must be



BLAIR AT BRUSSELS LAST MONTH
Bargaining away our nationhood

foreign affairs, defence, criminal justice, the economy and immigration are all basic to the Constitution. Blair claims that he has won the right for Britain to impose vetoes in some of these areas, but as he has surrendered so many vetoes in the past, this claim is worth virtually nothing.

As a token of just how much opposition Blair's Euro policy has stirred up in the country, a new rebel group of some hundred back-bench Labour MPs has now been estab-

Spearhead

No. 425 JULY 2004
PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT
Editor: John Tyndall

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British Nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless it is specifically stated otherwise, the views expressed in signed articles or letters in *Spearhead* are the sole responsibility of their writers and should not be taken as representing the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation that *Spearhead* may support editorially.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from prospective advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of the month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse, without giving reasons, to publish any advertisement submitted. The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* does not necessarily indicate that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function being advertised.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts for articles for possible publication. The most useful lengths are of around 1,000 to 1,850 words. *Spearhead* is currently produced using Serif PagePlus 6 software. Articles sent on 3.5" computer disk will be welcome if compatible. To ensure acceptance, however, they should also be sent in printed or typewritten format. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless the writers specifically request otherwise. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or in any other way amend articles submitted for publication.

Those wishing to reprint *Spearhead* articles in other publications should ensure when doing so to give public acknowledgement to both the writer and *Spearhead* and to include in the acknowledgement the magazine's full address.

reminded that the Allies in the West, like the Soviets in the East, enjoyed a very heavy preponderance over the Germans in both numbers and weapon power, particularly in the air. From the launching of Operation Barbarossa in 1941, the Germans were always fighting against overwhelming odds. Even at the time of the invasion of France in 1940 their numbers were inferior to those of the Franco-British forces.

Does all this really matter? Yes it does, because over the past 60 years there has for ever been a *political* dimension introduced into the discussion of Second World War history, and that dimension was glaringly present in the coverage of the D-Day celebrations last month. Not content with paying respects just to the brave men of that generation, our historians and journalists have persisted in reading into their courage and their sacrifices proof of some kind of superior virtue in the systems, ideologies and leaders for which and for whom they went to war; some kind of 'moral' message that rises above mere military valour and puts a special stamp on the proceedings. We find this distasteful and not in keeping with the true spirit of soldierly chivalry. When survivors of a hard-fought conflict get together long afterwards, their main thoughts are of the comradeship between them: between those still living and between the living and the dead; of their good luck in being still alive to remember and tell the tale; and – dare it be said – of the respect they had for their adversaries, who also contained their share of the bold, the brave and the noble. Such remembrance is cheapened by the obsession of politicians and professional scribblers with introducing divisions between 'good guys' and 'bad guys', somehow investing those who fought on the opposite side with less honour than they deserve.

Soldiers do not think much about these things; politicians and scribblers think of little else, and they degrade what should be ceremonies of dignity, pride and thankfulness.

And all that is a reason why World War II, and to a lesser extent World War I, are elevated by politicians and media to a status far out of proportion to their actual positions in British history – a history in which Blenheim, Quebec, Trafalgar and Waterloo represented much more important milestones in the rise of our nation from small island to great power. The establishment feels compelled constantly to exploit heroism on the battlefield to drive home its message of self-justification, to remind everyone of the victory of 'right' over 'wrong' instead simply of that of Britain over its enemies.

And we must speak here of enemies on the battlefield: the men who, through the quirks of fate and by the decisions of their

rulers, were thrown together as adversaries for a brief historical moment and obliged to kill each other by order: something very different from *natural* enemies representing inevitably conflicting interests.

One of the uncomfortable truths about World War II – especially hard to bear for those of us in Britain – is that the war was widely unpopular in this country, particularly by comparison with the one which preceded it 25 years earlier. Far more people than will ever be admitted were unconvinced that we had any good reason to fight Germany a second time. One consequence of this was that servicemen's instinct of self-preservation was somewhat stronger than it had been on the Somme and at Ypres, and that this resulted in less than heroic behaviour on the part of some individuals and units. In the First War, by 1918 we British had got our act together and were near to fully punching our weight; in the Second War we never really did so, though there were certainly instances of great valour on the part of many fighting men and regiments, and it is right to salute these and remember them.

Judging things by *overall* military performance, Britain cannot look back upon World War II as a demonstration of the national superiority on which we were so fond of congratulating ourselves at the time, and still do today; in fact that performance revealed deep flaws in our political leadership, our military command, our industrial machine, our political and social system and our way of life. Those flaws, far from being corrected in the ensuing years, have only become worse. We simply would not be fit to mount a Normandy invasion today, and there is little consolation in the thought that today neither would our erstwhile enemies be fit to oppose it.

It would therefore be much better if we were to commemorate these past battles in a somewhat lower key, paying respect to the men who fought well (on both sides), but not using the occasion to glorify a system which in fact was found wanting in many of the essentials of national capability.

Above all, we should learn to view the conflicts between Anglo-Celt and Teuton, whatever their outcomes, not as causes for celebration, but as devastating racial tragedies – slaughters of the best, as preludes to a world takeover by the worst.

Britain is not ready to see things in this way. When she is it will be a sign that we are on the road to better times.

The moral high ground?

While we are on the subject of World War II, we should mention an item of interest which appeared in *The Sunday Times* on the 20th June. This referred to 'dirty tricks'

operations carried out by the British Foreign Office during the war. Headed 'British "sex bombs" hit Nazi morale', the story stated that researches at the national archives at Kew had revealed the work of a special intelligence unit of the FO, run by Sefton Delmer, a tabloid journalist. The unit's speciality was concocting scandalous rumours about German and other Axis personnel designed to spread alarm and despondency and depress morale. Obscene postcards were dropped over the German lines spreading wholly fictitious stories such as one which alleged that SS troops had assembled the 'perfect Aryan girl' from the legs, arms and torsos of air-raid victims. Tales were spread about foreign workers sleeping with German soldiers' wives. One picture put around showed a black farm labourer having sex with a German *hausfrau*. Drawings were circulated showing the sons of German soldiers being raped by male Hitler Youth leaders, and wives having lesbian sex because they were 'lonely'.

This vile propaganda, bereft of the smallest grain of truth, was so bad that it even disgusted some British leaders at the time. Stafford Cripps, a member of Churchill's Government, tried to get it stopped but got nowhere, and it continued until the end of the war. Lies and dishonesty, combined with the most revolting pornography, were thought quite permissible if they served the purpose of defeating Hitler.

All this, it is worth remembering, was coming from the side that considered itself to be occupying the moral high ground in the conflict. It invites the question: If these fabrications are now being acknowledged, how much more fabrication – as yet not acknowledged – was employed in the propaganda of Britain and her allies in the war to make the world safe for 'democracy'?

Faces of Britain, 2004

What can be said of the appalling hooliganism of English football fans in Portugal that has not already been said more than once in these columns in the past? It is all very well to claim that the hooligans were a minority among the fans but the fact is that no other country in Europe produces comparable minorities. Again and again it is the Brits, mostly the English, who behave objectionably across the continent, whether they are there to watch football matches or simply to holiday.

There is a deep sickness in this country which sermons from journalists and politicians clearly do nothing to eradicate. It seems that only a social and cultural revolution which restore national pride, discipline and self-restraint will ever suffice. May the day soon dawn when this happens. In the meantime we can only expect more of the same.


PHONIES SOAK UP THE BRITISH BACKLASH

IT IS one of the commonest tricks in the textbook of modern power politics. When a ruling régime is threatened by radical opposition that looks like becoming dangerous, it heads that opposition off by the offer of a safety-valve designed to soak up public anger and thus neutralise it. A phoney 'opposition' is created to absorb the anger while the real opposition is marginalised and – the rulers of the régime will hope – rendered impotent.

This was what happened in the run-up to the Euro Elections which took place last month and resulted in a dramatic surge to third place by the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP).

UKIP was founded in September 1993 – by a strange coincidence(???) the same month as the British National Party won its first council seat in East London's Millwall. The official founder was an academic at the London School of Economics, Alan Sked. Sked was, and is, a liberal Tory who is opposed to the European Union but hates 'racism'. His political convictions may well be genuine, but there are grounds for thinking that the liberal establishment saw from the very beginning that UKIP could be used as a weapon for diverting public support from the BNP. It was not long before it began to be the beneficiary of donations that enabled it to out-resource the latter party by a considerable margin. At the same time, UKIP won nods of approval from mainstream journalists like Christopher Booker and Simon Heffer. It was presented in the press as the party to support if you were opposed to European Union, offering a kind of 'respectable' pseudo-patriotism. With this sponsorship, UKIP outperformed the BNP in the Euro Elections of 1999 and got three MEPs elected.

It didn't do them much good. Within a year the party was torn apart by internal quarrels. These were no doubt aggravated by competing egos but they were mainly due to policy disputes between people like Sked, who favoured retaining a wishy-washy liberal stance, and others who wanted a more radical approach which offered some acknowledgement of the immigration problem, albeit one that rigorously excluded any suggestion of 'racism'. In fact, UKIP selected one or two ethnic minority members as 'token' candidates in less important elections to see off the 'racist' charge.



KILROY

A semi-establishment figure who has helped to popularise UKIP

In 2001 veteran Tory Lord Tebbit claimed that two leading UKIP officials were agents of MI6, the foreign section of the Government's counter-espionage network. Tebbit was probably a little off-target but his allegations were not totally wild.

What is much more probable is that UKIP, like the BNP, had been infiltrated by agents of home-affairs security body MI5 with a view to neutering it and, if possible, weakening it by fomenting internal divisions. This could have been part of the cause of the in-fighting that broke out in the year 2000 – just at a time when the party should have been capitalising on its Euro successes of a year previously. It will be recalled that similar in-fighting broke out in the BNP shortly after the Millwall victory, in that case generated by Combat 18 – later exposed as

having been run by Scotland Yard's Special Branch. This put the BNP back for a couple of years until it started to recover in the mid-1990s.

The majority of members of UKIP, including many of its leaders, are no doubt genuine patriots, albeit people craving 'respectability' on account of their jobs and professional status and therefore reluctant to embrace full-blooded nationalism. However, there is evidence that the party is being manipulated by certain elements within and without with the intention that it will serve as an establishment tool. This would explain the tremendous media build-up it received in the run-up to last month's elections. The popular celebrities who jumped aboard the party, notably former Labour MP and latter-day chat-show host Robert Kilroy-Silk, would never have done so had they been in danger of the media crucifixion routinely visited upon genuine nationalists.

What happens in, and to, UKIP in the times to come remains to be seen. There will undoubtedly be pressure within for a stronger commitment to nationalist policies. This, at the same time, would terrify the softer elements, who at the moment predominate. There there are the ingredients of crippling divisions, easy to stir up in a movement lacking a firm ideological core.

We suspect that UKIP may prove to be an ephemeral phenomenon. What is more important is the number of people who voted for it. These comprise a potent force for change in British politics.

The things they're saying

Whether this country could ever again find the will and the sense of common purpose to launch another great mobilisation such as was seen in 1914 or 1939 must, however, thanks to the events of the ensuing six decades, by very much in doubt. In that sense the D-Day generation, for all the wrong turns it took in peace, is very much the last that could ever merit the adjective 'heroic'. They deserve our admiration; but when they are gone, where will we find our example, in time of need?

SIMON HEFFER
The Spectator (5.6.04)

... the picture of the military position in mid-1944 was often wanting. As some have already complained, commentators glided over the Russian position. While 15 Allied divisions in the West were fighting 15 German divisions, 400 divisions slugged it out on the Eastern Front. The Russians accounted for nearly 90 per cent of German troops killed in the war...

A belief in American altruism has been a great misleading legacy. They did only what was in their self-interest (I do not complain about that).

At first, they sold us armaments very profitably, providing an immense stimulus for US industry. When our cash ran out, they provided Lend-Lease. But that envisaged post-war repayment plus conditions about post-war British economic policy, including the abandonment of Commonwealth preference...

There has also been too much overblown rhetoric about our forces fighting for 'freedom'. Yes, but only in the sense of freedom not to be ruled by Germany. It was a patriotic, not ideological, war.

We could also have done with less talk about fighting 'Nazi' troops. The National Socialist Party accounted for only a small portion of the population. We were fighting the *Germans*.

ANDREW ALEXANDER
Daily Mail (11.6.04)

Modern Britain could not organise, mount or successfully complete a military operation on the scale of D-Day. We are no longer physically or morally capable of such an action, and can only hope we are never tested in the way that our forebears were.

We like to delude ourselves. We rely on things remaining pretty much as they always have been and are surprised when they turn out to have rusted or rotted or crumbled away...

Compared with the people of 1944, we make very little, produce very little and do very little. The great strategic industries

EXTRACTS FROM THE MAINSTREAM MEDIA

essential for war – steel, shipbuilding, engineering, aviation – are shrunken or gone...

Another thing that has gone is the willingness to accept that sometimes the country comes first.

PETER HITCHENS
The Mail on Sunday (6.6.04)

What is the meaning of the sudden emergence of UKIP, which has put the established political parties into such a panic? Is it our fear of being coerced and put at the mercy of the vast, complicated, mysterious and notoriously corrupt bureaucracy misleadingly known as 'Europe'? Yes, but it must have been a feeling far stronger than that which made so many voters reject the established politicians who have betrayed us.

Is it our anger at everything that has gone wrong with England in the last half-century and transformed it utterly from the country it had been for centuries: mass immigration of alien people; incessant propaganda for 'multiracialism' in its various forms; laws which have made it difficult if not impossible to discuss these matters honestly and openly? Is it our anger at being at the mercy of a system of thought which has reduced a once-independent-minded people to a state of morbid guilt that defies their instincts and even their common sense?

What is really surprising is that no such explosion of anger has occurred long before this, that the left-liberal establishment has succeeded so well in silencing all effective opposition. However moderate, tentative and limited UKIP now seems to be, it may just possibly be the precursor of a genuine revolt against the deceptively mild-seeming tyranny of the conventional parties.

PETER SIMPLE
The Daily Telegraph (18.6.04)

The BNP has started to fill the vacuum left by the mainstream politicians over race, and now the United Kingdom Independence Party has emerged to do the same on Europe. There is nothing much to be said for UKIP, a racket collection of con-men, perjurers, convicted criminals and semi-racists. There is a hint of Oswald Mosley about Kilroy-Silk, with his big talk about the 'old' political parties making way for the new politics.

At present, in a time of prosperity and full employment, Kilroy-Silk can safely be regarded as a poor-taste joke and a safe protest vote. Though he himself will soon be safely forgotten, he has his terrible importance. He is a warning, a prototype for something altogether nastier and more horrible, and when it emerges it will be a direct consequence of the

dishonesty of the modern political class. It is time that our mainstream, respectable politicians dealt candidly with the British people, before someone else does it for them.

PETER OBORNE
The Spectator (12.6.04)

So a UKIP vote at the general election will actually be a perfectly sensible action, and many will take it. It will hasten the end of the useless Tories and so bring forward the foundation of the new pro-British movement we so badly need.

That movement will not be the UKIP, for it will need far more depth and breadth and height. But Robert Kilroy-Silk and the UKIP are clearing the way for it.

PETER HITCHENS
The Mail on Sunday (20.6.04)

What do the race warriors do at the weekends? I've often wondered.

They spend the week locked in their ebony towers, trying to eradicate anything which might cause offence to the 'ethnic minorities'.

They live in a world of separate 'communities', encourage us to celebrate 'diversity' and dream up policies to promote 'inclusivity'.

But do they ever step outside their committee rooms and workshops? Do they ever raise their eyes from the *Guardian* society pages long enough to notice what's actually going on in society?

I only ask because the world they would have us believe we live in bears little resemblance to the one I see around me.

RICHARD LITTLEJOHN
The Sun (25.5.04)

'Honest journalist' is greeted with snickers because it is a contradiction in terms. The words are mutually exclusive. Honest journalists go to the highest bidder and do his bidding and pretend they believe what they write.

TAKI
The Spectator (29.5.04)

The politics of EU summits and the politics of referendums are about as far apart as it is possible to be. Up until the very moment when the deal was clinched, last week's meeting was a showcase of all that is least edifying about such gatherings: the back-slapping of a well-fed élite, the ignominious horse-trading, the whispered insults, the dishonest use of textual ambiguity to paper over division, the moments of hapless political paralysis...

MATTHEW D'ANCONA
The Sunday Telegraph (20.6.04)

WRONG PRIORITIES - WRONG RESULTS

FIVE YEARS AGO, just after the Euro Elections of 1999 and while I was still chairman of the British National Party, I convened a conference of top party officials to discuss the outcome of those elections and the lessons they had provided for us. High on the agenda of this conference was the proposition that fighting for seats in Europe, though it had brought us some very welcome spin-offs in publicity and recruitment, had not repaid the huge investment the party had made in money and effort, and that we should seriously consider abandoning Euro Elections for the foreseeable future.

For myself, I was about 95 per cent convinced in this view; but I wanted to hear the opinions of others before incorporating it firmly into party policy. From the very beginning, I had not been among the most ardent enthusiasts in the party for contesting Euro Elections, but I had been persuaded by others that we should give it a try. Both principle and expediency had governed my thinking on this. In principle, the BNP should decline to recognise the legitimacy of the European Parliament, which it might have appeared to be doing by taking part in European Elections. Against this was the view that by contesting elections to the Parliament, provided we did so on sufficient a scale, we could obtain the benefits of TV time and the postal distribution of vast numbers of election leaflets that would get across our policy for quitting the EU and serve as an excellent means of recruitment. It was a view that merited strong consideration.

But this view – the expedient view – seemed strongly balanced by an alternative view, also based on expediency. This was that the sections of the British public accustomed to support the BNP on issues like immigration would not necessarily do so on Europe – even if, as was far from certain, they were sufficiently motivated by the European issue even to bother to vote at all.

The UKIP factor

Added to this was the fact that in the Euro political arena we would be opposed by the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), which would probably appeal to a wider section of the Euro-sceptic voters than we could. In other words, in contesting Euro Elections we would be fighting at a decided disadvantage in relation to UKIP. In elections where immigration was a major issue, we would be fighting on a battleground favourable to ourselves; in those where the main

issue was Europe, we would be fighting on ground favourable to UKIP. So it transpired in the 1999 Euro Elections, in which UKIP won three seats and the BNP none.

I approved the decision to contest the Euro Elections in 1999 because it was something that had not been tried, and had it never been tried there would forever have lingered

Last month's elections: a frank assessment by JOHN TYNDALL



in the party the feeling that we had forfeited an opportunity from which we might have derived massive benefit.

But in the outcome I came to believe that the benefit, though not to be derided, did not justify the mammoth effort we had put into those elections. I put this matter up for debate in the party, and waited to receive some feedback. But then events overtook us; I was replaced as party leader and my part in the debate (if there was any) was at an end.

I changed my opinions on Euro Elections very slightly as a result of the great successes the BNP enjoyed in the North West of England in the general election of 2001 and the local government elections in 2002 and 2003. Because of these, I felt that we should contest the Euro seats in that region and maybe two others, as there seemed the possibility of a return that could send one

BNP candidate to the Euro Parliament. However, I never entertained the wildly optimistic expectations of success that were expressed in official party publications, which projected onto the North West Region as a whole the excellent votes we had received in just a small number of areas there. This very cautious viewpoint of mine was discussed privately with some close friends and associates in the party, and there was general agreement on it among us, some of them not even entertaining my hope that we might get one candidate elected in the North West. We did not bring this viewpoint to general notice within the party, as it would no doubt have invited the accusation that we were putting a damper on things and undermining members' morale and resolve! We quietly kept our own counsel and waited to see whom events would prove to be right.

One factor which contributed to our caution was the certainty that UKIP would be contesting the Euro Elections everywhere; including the North West of England, and that that party would make considerable inroads into our support. At that time we did not anticipate the tremendous surge that UKIP would make in the last weeks of the Euro Election campaign, with a huge publicity drive backed by financial resources way out of our league, with big mass media coverage and with several popular celebrities jumping on board. This clearly was not foreseen either by the present BNP leadership, and we do not hold them to blame for this.

But what the leadership should have foreseen from the very beginning – based on our 1999 experience – was that Euro Elections did not provide favourable ground for a massive commitment of money and effort to them by the BNP, particularly with UKIP as rivals in the field, as it was always certain they would be.

Local government elections should have had priority

Where the favourable ground did undoubtedly exist was the arena of elections to local government all over England and Wales. It was on this ground that the BNP had consistently done well and consistently performed better than UKIP. There existed huge opportunities for it to build on this success and win many more seats this year. But it required that overwhelming priority be given to local government elections, and a relatively minor commitment to Euro Elections, with far fewer regions contested.

But instead, the party leadership decided

on the very reverse. The overwhelming priority was given to the Euro Elections, while local government elections came off second best by a long way.

A hugely ambitious fund-raising campaign was launched to pay for the fielding of Euro candidates in every region of mainland Britain, and a great deal of money was raised – due to the magnificent sacrifices of great numbers of party supporters, who had been persuaded that these sacrifices were worthwhile. Had even half of this money been devoted to enabling the party to make a stronger challenge in local government elections, with a higher volume of literature output, with posters and many other local election aids, that challenge would have been immensely strengthened. In the end, the party emerged with no Euro seats and just four council seats more than it had had previous to these elections, but in many areas BNP candidates came so close to winning that that extra money could well have tipped the scales between defeat and victory.

Out of focus

And that is not all. Money aside, the focus of the party's leadership was so heavily tipped towards the Euro Elections that, again, local government elections came off second best. Everywhere, we relied on energy and initiative to be shown by local leaders, who simply did not receive the backing and encouragement from the top that they should have done. Considering this, their efforts were highly praiseworthy. Particular praise must be given to the efforts made in Bradford, where four councillors were elected, and in Epping Forest, where three BNP candidates got in.

Doubtless, party spin-doctors will make a big issue out of the fact that one of these three was the Jewish candidate, Mrs. Pat Richardson. However, two other candidates (non-Jewish) were also successful, and it is fair to say that it was the well-organised local campaign, rather than the identity of one of the candidates, that was decisive in this poll.

The party did not, in the end, get the hoped-for councillor on the Greater London Authority. Here the UKIP intervention was a handicap (two UKIP candidates were elected). The party leadership was not to blame for the UKIP factor here, as it was in the case of the Euro Elections, but it stands to be indicted for putting less effort into the GLA than it should have done. We know of cases of London activists being diverted to campaigns outside the Metropolis, when just that bit more effort there could have tipped the scales between the 4.7 per cent we received and the five-plus per cent that might have won us one seat.

One factor that was trotted out as justification for the excessive commitment to the European Elections was the massive Euro payroll: the obscene salaries and allowances doled out to MEPs with the obvious

intention of making them compliant and ready to put their jobs before their countries. It was proclaimed to the BNP membership that the party would reap massive benefits from this bounty by way of its own MEPs making over 40 per cent of their earnings to party funds (an allocation which would still have left them with incomes only dreamt of by the vast majority in the party). There have been some in the party who have maintained that it was this expected financial bonanza, rather than any rational calculation of *political* benefits, that shaped the decision to go flat out for the Euro seats rather than concentrate more resources on getting councillors elected. This will probably forever remain a bone of contention in party circles, but at the end of the day the proof of the pudding must be found in the eating, and those who determined party strategy in the 2004 elections must be judged by the results obtained. The big Euro payola did not materialise because the seats were not won; the rest becomes academic.

Factors in previous success

When the BNP was scoring spectacular electoral successes in 2001, 2002 and 2003 we maintained in this journal that this was due to remarkable climatic changes in British public opinion, not to various policy and presentational gimmicks adopted by the party. We added, of course, that much credit had to go to local organisers and activists in the successful areas, who had fought intelligent and energetic campaigns.

We must be consistent with this principle and acknowledge that disappointments in last month's elections cannot be laid entirely at the door of the party leadership and blamed on its various gimmicks, which I have always maintained have made no difference one way or the other to electoral performance. This time climatic conditions were less favourable to the BNP than in the past, and the tremendous build-up given by the media to UKIP, allied to its lavishly financed publicity campaign, undoubtedly contributed to this. The BNP will have also suffered from increased public hatred of the Blair Government – particularly in connection with Iraq – and a desire to deliver a blow against it by any means available. These factors most affected our party in the Euro Elections, but they did have consequences elsewhere which were outside our own control, notably in London.

Nevertheless, the disastrous decision to throw the preponderant weight of BNP resources behind the drive to win seats in Europe must still be accounted the main factor in last month's frustrated efforts. This factor, unlike some others, was within the party's control, and it badly failed to get its priorities right. In particular, it failed to concentrate more effort in those wards where existing council seats were being defended, with the result that a number were lost.

There is an interesting aside to all this. The UKIP leadership, no doubt under pressure from the party's grass roots, altered its former policy of refusing to face the immigration issue, and came out with a watered-down manifesto for controlling the immigrant influx. With recent trimming of BNP immigration and race policies, together with the fielding of a Jewish candidate and the inclusion of a Sikh in a BNP election broadcast, the consequence was very little clear water on this key national issue between the BNP and UKIP. What it amounted to was that where immigration was concerned UKIP was permitted to steal most of the BNP's clothes. If the public wanted a half-baked policy for dealing with immigration, shorn of any mention of the racial factor, it was presented with a much more attractive one in UKIP's case, backed as this was by a high-powered and amply financed PR machine rather than the shoe-string budget on which the BNP was forced to operate. This was unintelligent politics, coming from people who are constantly lecturing us all on intelligent politics.

The future

We should end this sobering analysis on a note of optimism. The BNP has missed big opportunities in these recent elections due to foolish strategies, but its overall percentages of the vote have been impressive. The political landscape is not greatly changed from what it was when we shook the nation by our successes last year. There is still a tremendous tide flowing against the globalist establishment and in favour of nationalism. That establishment has emerged much weaker from these elections than it was previously. Our opportunities are correspondingly much greater than they were previously. If there is any change in the landscape at all, it is a change that favours us in the times to come.

We should remember another thing from the 1999 Euro results. Although UKIP got three MEPs elected, it didn't do them much good in political terms. Within a year they were convulsed by internal quarrels – as was predictable in a party with no ideological backbone, lacking in strong leaders and full of people looking for a political 'quick fix'.

But we need to learn some very fundamental lessons from our own wasted opportunities of 2004. There must be a serious debate within the party over where we are going to go from here, and that debate must not be stifled by the mini-totalitarians amongst us, who view criticism of party decisions as treason to the party itself.

The activists who have worn out foot-wear trudging the streets in recent campaigns, and the donors who have dug deep in their pockets to meet hugely ambitious financial targets, have a lot of questions to ask. They are entitled to be listened to, and now is the time for this process to begin.

TYNDALL IN AMERICA

Spearhead's editor reports on a pleasurable and useful trip Stateside



Tyndall speaks at dinner in Arlington.
Chairman Sam Francis is seated on left.

AT the end of May and into June I had the great pleasure of taking up an invitation to visit the United States to fulfil three speaking engagements, the first of which was to address the International European-American Unity and Leadership Conference in New Orleans. This gathering, at which about 300 were in attendance, was organised in part to welcome the well-known American patriotic leader David Duke back to freedom following a prison sentence for alleged tax irregularities, commonly believed to have been a politically motivated frame-up engineered by his enemies, who are many and powerful.

This was my third speaking visit to the USA but my first to New Orleans. The city is, of course, closely associated with jazz musicians – something which, as my friends will know, carried no interest whatever to me. It is nevertheless well worth visiting for some of the old-world sights, notably the French Quarter, which manages to reproduce a uniquely European flavour in the local architecture – rare in the country. The city also contains many magnificent old colonial-style houses, built mostly in the

19th century for those who grew rich on the cotton trade.

The conference was impressive and featured many fine and well-known speakers. A hotel close to the Airport had been virtually commandeered for the weekend, and people booking in there came from all over the United States, as well as Canada. The speakers, apart from David Duke himself, included the moderator of the world-famed Stormfront website Don Black; Sam Dickson, the Atlanta lawyer and an old friend from way back; Dr. Edward Fields, editor of the long-running *The Truth at Last* newspaper, also an old friend whom I was delighted to meet again with his wife Jane; Kevin Alfred Strom, the presenter of the radio programme *American Dissident Voices*; Germar Rudolf, the courageous German revisionist historian; Paul Fromm from Canada, a teacher who suffered greatly for his political views in what is today a country straight out of Orwell's 1984 in its intolerance of nationalist dissidents; David Pringle, membership co-ordinator of the National Alliance; and veteran publisher Willis Carto. These big names apart, I was delighted to meet many other fine patriots from all over the North American continent, and enjoy many conversations during breaks between the items on the programme. It was very pleasing to see Paul Fromm's Canadian party display the traditional Red Ensign flag of Canada behind their literature table, together with a banner referring to their country as the *Dominion* of Canada – a most welcome snub to political correctness!

The keynote speech of the weekend was given by David Duke at the end of an excellent dinner on Saturday evening. He began by speaking of the tragedy of the Iraq war and subsequent occupation, in which so many Americans had died, and went on to indict President Bush and his largely Zionist administration for their criminal folly in embroiling the United States in this region of the world in quarrels in which she (like Britain) had no interest. From this he went on to a very general coverage of the American political scene, which was powerfully delivered and received at the end with rapturous applause.

My own contribution to the proceedings was made in the early afternoon of Saturday, and the text of this (slightly abridged) follows this report. I had a short time previously heard a superb presentation by Sam Dickson on the insanity of 'liberals', whom he accused of being afflicted by an inexplicable death-wish. His speech was spiced with much humour in its caricaturing of the liberal mind.

On the Monday following the confer-

ence I flew with Sam Dickson to Atlanta, Georgia, where I was his guest for two days, during which I addressed a small meeting of local friends of like mind at a nearby location, with about 25 people present. Here I was surprised, though greatly pleased, to encounter a few who had attended gatherings to which I had spoken in the same neighbourhood in 1979 and 1991. On this stage of my trip I also met a friend of Sam Dickson's, Josh Buckley, co-editor of the book *Tyr*, which deals with the folklore and religious customs of Northern Europe in pre-Christian times.

My final port of call was the Washington DC area – or, to be more specific, its Virginia suburbs. I stayed at the home of *American Renaissance* publisher and editor Jared Taylor and his wife Evelyn, to whom I am grateful for many kindnesses. Before that I was met at the airport and then taken to lunch by one of America's finest patriotic writers, Sam Francis, who was a mainstream professional journalist with the *Washington Times* before being fired for his outspoken views. Since then he has been an independent writer with the *Citizens Informer* and other publications.

While at Jared Taylor's home I met two of his young colleagues Ian Jobling and Steve Webster, who assist him in the production and management of *American Renaissance*. Steve Webster kindly gave up part of his day on June 3rd to take me on a tour of the battlefield of Bull Run, which featured prominently in the American Civil War, or, as they prefer to call it there, the War Between the States.

Then in the evening I addressed a dinner gathering of about 40 people in a restaurant in nearby Arlington, which was chaired by Sam Francis. This was a very pleasant occasion, with some interesting questions following my speech. Throughout the United States there is a great interest in our movement here in Britain and the common problems with which patriots in both countries have to cope.

The following day I flew home – always a gruelling experience for me when travelling in a west-to-east direction, with the jet-lag worse when going that way.

Abiding impressions of America from my third trip there? Well, I have to say that in New Orleans, Atlanta and the suburbs of Washington the ethnic minority presence is absolutely overpowering. Americans are simply losing their country. So, of course, are we but the process over there is much further advanced. It seemed that everywhere I went Blacks were a majority, although in other areas Hispanics are reputed to be even more numerous. American patriots have a real mountain to climb arresting and reversing this process. Good luck to them – they certainly need it!



David Duke at New Orleans conference

Whites' choice: fight or die!

Here, slightly abridged, is the text of the speech delivered by Spearhead editor John Tyndall to the International European-American Unity and Leadership Conference in New Orleans, U.S.A., on the 29th June, held to welcome well-known American nationalist leader David Duke, home from prison, where he had served one year on a framed charge:-

Mr. Duke, Ladies and Gentlemen, Fellow Whites!

I'd like to thank Mr. Duke and all the others concerned for this invitation to come and speak to you here this weekend.

Perhaps I may be permitted a few words of introduction of myself in the context of this occasion. I'm one of those well able to understand how David Duke is feeling right now in his first month of freedom. I've been where he's just been! In 1986 I was sent to jail, in my case for six months, for writing and publishing words "liable to stir up racial hatred" – not an offence here in America – yet – though I'm well aware that certain people here are working on this!

So, as one heretic to another, perhaps I ought to suggest to Mr. Duke that we get together, with a few others present here, to form a patriotic ex-jailbirds' association!

When I was given my freedom after sentence in 1986 I too had a welcome-home meeting and said something then which could do with repeating now. I said that history provides ample examples of the truth that those who are in jail today may well be in power tomorrow.

I also said, again pointing out to history, that those who are in power today might well be in jail tomorrow! (*laughter and applause*).

This is a particularly appropriate time to dwell on that theme – because we have many politicians, in your country and mine (perhaps thousands or even tens of thousands) who should rightly be in jail for the crimes they've committed against our people! (*applause*).

America and race

I've always enjoyed coming to America. I've always been greatly interested in America. And I've always thought that no one with the least knowledge of the history and development of your country could possibly believe in the current madness of racial equality.

Here is a great continent of boundless wealth but which was just a wilderness before the coming of the white man. It was white men – and white women – who tamed it, developed it, built it – created a civilisation here. And yet now the white people are being asked to surrender that civilisation – in the name of race equality!

I say again: who can possibly know the history of America and still believe in race equality?

I ask a similar question of the leaders of the church – the clergy, the priesthood. These people spend their working lives



Tyndall: a shot from the audience

surrounded by the artifacts of the genius of the white man. They gaze up to the towering heights of the great cathedrals – St. Peter's (Rome), Chartres, Burgos, Cologne, Lincoln, Durham – and see the intricate carvings, the work of ordinary artisans of our race, working centuries before we had cranes and other modern implements of building, using primitive wooden scaffolding that could easily – and sometimes did – collapse under them.

Even those who minister in the smaller churches, dotted in their thousands across the white world, must get a feel, every day of their working lives, of the white man's heritage of skill and creativity, if only by beholding the beautiful stained glass windows or hearing the glorious religious music: the St. Matthew Passion, the *Missa Solemnis*. In the whole vast length and breadth of Africa, nothing has been produced over thousands of years to equal one small cornice created by Michelangelo in the Sistine Chapel. Not all the noise that has emanated from Africa across the centuries – together with that we hear coming from the African outposts in Detroit (*laughter*) and Liverpool – is worth half a dozen bars of a quintet by Schubert.

The clergy and the priesthood live more closely to this heritage than any of us. Yet we find them everywhere in the vanguard of the movement to pull down white civilisation and promote multi-racialism – which means, of course, the death of our people.

Every day of our lives we're surrounded by the marvels of modern technology. We work with the brilliant inventions of our ancestors and our contemporaries. But do we pause to think that about 90 per cent of these inventions can be traced to just three countries: the United States, Britain and Germany? I'm sure almost everybody does think about this – but it's not the done thing to talk about it in polite company. It leads us along the dangerous paths of political incorrectness, lurking at the end of which is the universally feared bogey of

'racism'!

Your compatriot Neil Armstrong, when he set foot on the moon back in 1969, said: "One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind." Mr. Armstrong, who very rightly is a national hero in this country, was being diplomatic. It wasn't a giant leap for 'mankind' at all; it was a giant leap specifically for white mankind – in particular White America, with some help from other Whites, especially Germans. 'Mankind' as a whole had nothing whatever to do with it. The technology leading to the conquest of space, like virtually all the other technology that surrounds us, is the White Man's creation – even if a few other races have been able to imitate it (*applause*).

So again, how can it be that intelligent people working every day with the marvels of modern technology, to which Africans have contributed nothing, can seriously believe in race equality?

How, again, can those of the church, who live every day close to the great works of art of Europeans across the ages, believe in race equality?

The answer to these questions is a very simple one: they don't believe in it!

Non-belief in equality

Americans don't believe in race equality. British people don't believe in race equality. The clergy doesn't believe in race equality. Whites everywhere know race equality is nonsense – at least most of them.

But they're scared to admit it!

And this, my fellow white folk, is our big problem. This is the nature of what we're struggling with.

White people across the western world today remind me of the people of Russia in the twilight years of communism: they're all serving a huge lie. Most of them know it's a lie – because their own experience tells them it's a lie. But they go on serving that lie – because they have jobs that depend on the lie; they have salaries they could lose if they challenged the lie; they have positions in society that are tied in with those jobs. The more ambitious of them – that is the élite – have their eyes on career promotion. If they buck the big lie, they can forget about that promotion – if indeed they keep their jobs at all!

This is particularly so with people in the key sectors of society – journalists and broadcasters, academics, above all politicians – the sectors of society who have the influence to decide what kind of a society it'll be, who direct national affairs.

In Communist Russia there was even more at stake. In addition to all those things there was state terror. If you refused to serve the lie there was the early morning knock on the door. There was the gulag.

So in all these societies millions of people spend their lives serving a huge lie – or, if not serving it actively, serving it passively – looking the other way when

Contd. overleaf

WHITES' CHOICE:

FIGHT OR DIE!

(Contd. from prev. page)

confronted with a great injustice tied in with the maintenance of the lie (as in the case of Ernst Zündel), writing and speaking what they knew to be nonsense – because that's what their jobs, their positions in society, their ambitions – in the case of Soviet Russia their freedom, even their lives – dictate that that's what they have to do.

The need for power

In other words, ladies and gentlemen, the lie prevails, the lie rules, because it has power on its side.

And this is the key fact which we all have to grasp. It's not enough to have the weapon of truth. We have to have the weapon of power if the truth is to prevail.

Now all this is pretty obvious. It doesn't take a genius to work it out. Our activity must be geared to the winning of power – first, just a little power – then more power – finally complete power. Activity geared to anything else is a waste of time.

Here in America David Duke serves as an admirable example of this. He geared his activities to the winning of power. He said and did what was necessary to win power. And he did win a little bit of power – here in Louisiana, as a state legislator.

This was an enormous inspiration to us in Britain – and all over the world. My party back at home, the British National Party, has focused its entire strategy on winning power. And we have won a little bit of power. Right now we have 16 town councillors. It's tiny, but it's a beginning. And it's amazing how differently you're perceived if you have even a little bit of power. Let me give you an example...

Burnley is a small to medium-sized town in Lancashire in the North West of England which suffers from the same ills as many towns here in America. It's been invaded by the ethnic minorities. The Whites have been dispossessed and they're very unhappy about it. In the local government elections in 2002 our party, the BNP, got three councillors elected. Now we have six, but then we just had three.

I was scheduled to speak at a meeting of the Burnley BNP in August 2002. When I arrived there, a howling, smelling, filthy, demented left-wing mob had assembled (*laughter*). I'm sure you're familiar with them – the travelling freak show, the best freak show in town! They were there to cause trouble – if possible to stop the meeting. To keep order there were plenty of police. Now in the past we've often felt we had a raw deal from the police. We were the people keeping within the law. Our opponents were the ones intent on breaking the law. Yet very often the police were as heavy on us as on them. But on this particular night the police treated us with respect, courtesy and friendliness, and they dealt with the red rabble thoroughly and efficiently.

What had made the difference? We had three local councillors. That's what made the difference. We had a little bit of power. And the police knew that we only had that power because a lot of local people supported us.

My point – which I cannot hammer home often enough – is that the appeal of an idea, whatever its merits in terms of truth, in terms of common sense, is multiplied ten times over if behind it there is power – even just a little bit of power.

Winning people over

But now let's turn from the obvious to the not-so-obvious. And I'm going to talk about the question that occupies us all. We know that we're right, and that the idea of race equality is wrong: indeed, not only the idea of race equality but the whole of the 'liberal' consensus that goes with it. But still millions of our fellow countrymen and women go on – passively if not actively – supporting race equality and the liberal consensus. They vote for the politicians and the parties that represent that consensus. We rack our brains trying to think of new ideas, new public relations techniques, new ways of appealing to people, to break this consensus.

And here's where some us commit a cardinal error.

Some us latch onto the seductive theory that, if the masses are not yet voting for us, it's because we don't present our ideas softly enough, gently enough – because we're a bit too uncompromising, because, perhaps, we're even a little too honest!

Wrap our ideas up in a gentler packaging. Modify them a little. Tell a little less than the truth. Introduce a little compromise. Don't put it all over too harshly – and hey presto! All those millions who were frightened to support us in the past will now support us. We'll appear all sweet and reasonable, and they won't be able to resist our appeal!

Ladies and gentlemen, all this is an illusion, a tragic illusion. It doesn't work, and as someone who has been in this struggle about 47 years I know what I'm talking about. It won't work.

This is not to say that packaging isn't important. It's not to say that presenting our ideas in the most attractive way should not be aimed at. David Duke has proved a master at this here in America. I've seen videos of some of his interviews. He's the best interviewee on 'our side' that I've seen. He has that priceless ability to keep his cool when confronted by the most hostile and obnoxious interviewer. He does it better than I do. If I dislike a TV interviewer – and I dislike most of them intensely (*laughter*) – I find it very difficult to conceal it. Perhaps it's the Irish in my make-up (I'm half Irish, albeit orange Irish as distinct from green Irish). But when put on the spot by these creeps I find my hackles rising. I daresay Mr. Duke does too, but he controls it all so well. And that's a big asset – a big advantage.

But to return to the point. A polite, dignified, friendly presentation of our ideas – our cause – is desirable. No question

about it. But this is a world away from softening up and compromising, of trying to appease our enemies – **because believe you me, our enemies will never, never, never be appeased!** (*applause*).

And more to the point, Mr. and Mrs. General Public won't be won over. You can try to win them over by toning down the strength of our message, wrapping it up in cotton wool, and you'll find yourself up against exactly the same barriers as before: jobs, careers, salaries, mortgages on the house, the new car in the driveway, the school fees for the kids, the eye on promotion in the company, the concern about one's social position. Your prospect – your would-be recruit – is being asked to take a very big step, a step across the Rubicon, as he may see it. He is being asked to get involved with an unconventional political cause – a political cause that's presented as 'extreme', 'evil', beyond the pale – by the Jewish media. As he considers that prospect, all these things – career promotion, the house, the wife, the family, security, social position – flash across his mind. To him, it's a frightening jump.

Now my point is this. If this person is not yet ready to take that jump, not all the softening up, not all the compromising, not all the trimming in the world, is going to persuade him. He may trot out for your benefit the excuse that your ideas are too 'extreme'. But if you come back a year later and present those ideas in a much milder form he'll still find them too 'extreme' – or he'll find some other excuse. What you're up against here is a person whose perception is that we're dangerous people to get involved with because – at the moment – **we're not powerful**.

The first lesson is to realise that it's our *lack of power* – not our so-called 'extremism' – that's the big deterrent.

What is 'extremism'?

What is 'extremism'? At different times across history, 'extremism' has meant different things. Not long ago, here in America our ideas were perfectly mainstream. Only 'odd' people, marginalised people, 'extremists', believed in race equality. So what has changed since then? Has the truth changed? Is what was true then no longer true now? No! What has changed is *power*. Power then was very simply in different hands. And that's what we're up against. Those who have the power today – **and we know who they are!** – are able to determine what is 'mainstream' and 'respectable' and what is 'extreme'.

So we have to understand that 'extremism' is a meaningless term. It is entirely what the current makers of opinion decide it'll be, no more, no less.

And here is where we must recognise something very important. We white patriots must never fall into the trap of accepting or using our enemies' definition of the word 'extremist' – anymore than we should accept or use our enemies' definition of the word 'racist'. These words are

enemy inventions – designed to put an end to discussion. The moment we start to use them – and especially if we start to view their meanings as the enemy would have us view them, we're fighting the battle on the enemy's ground. We're fighting according to his rules.

And we'll be fighting on the enemy's ground, and according to the enemy's rules, once we start to imagine that we're going to win over people by softening our principles. People simply are not impressed by this. They detect phoniness, and I'm quite sure that the American people, like the British people, have had quite enough of phonies as political leaders. If you want to operate as a phoney, I've news for you – George W. Bush and Tony Blair can do it far better than you can, far better than we can, and they'll beat us every time! (*loud applause*).

Don't show weakness

We must always remember that the people we are looking to win over are a bit weaker than we are – not weaker in every way: many of them have excellent war records – but weaker in their political attitudes. This means that it's up to us to infuse them with something of our strength. Our strength has to rub off on them as we speak to them, for that's the only way we're going to get them to come with us.

If we radiate weakness by being anything less than 100 per cent convinced of the rightness of our cause, by presenting our ideas to people in a half-baked way – as if we're apologising for them – our own uncertainty, our own weakness, will communicate itself to the people we want to convert, and that will justify their weakness to themselves. That will vindicate them in their own cowardice.

And that's why I oppose utterly the tactics of going to people and saying: "Really, we're not racists!" That, straightaway, is an admission that we recognise 'racism' as wrong. And if we do that, we may as well run up the white flag. I **never, never, never deny the charge of being a racist.** I don't go about shouting that I'm a racist – because that's admitting the validity of a piece of the enemy's language – but I never run away from the charge of 'racism' – and I recommend that neither should you! (*applause*)

Interesting times

Now to wind up, I might quote the words of a Chinese sage who used to say to people: "May you live in interesting time." And we most certainly do live in very interesting times. We live in a time when history can be made. In fact, history screams out to be made by people like us. We look out there among the general public: the brainwashed boobies in their millions whom Sam (*Dickson*)* has so perfectly described – all these people who've been ruled by the 'liberal' consensus, the consensus of produce-and-consume; people who are going nowhere. In healthy times, great nations are conscious of their past, and they're conscious of their duty to pass on what has been won by those in the

past to those in the future. The broad mass of the public in Britain – and I suspect in America today – are enslaved by this live-for-the-moment, produce-and-consume society; a people that's going nowhere. A great many of them think that way – an awful lot of unhappy people. Again, Sam put it so well. He talked about the joy of participation in our struggle, and I can underline that 100 times over. We are the happy people. We're not as wealthy as they are. We're perhaps not as secure. We may not have the two cars in the driveway. We may not have all the luxuries they have. But we have a deep exhilaration, a meaning to our lives, each and every one of us, in our contribution, whether it's large or small.

We are *living*. They are suffering a living death, those masses out there. But they're not irretrievable – because we can bring them, by our example, into the ranks of the living, with us. And we can give them a purpose to their lives which they've lost – due to the utter lack of leadership they've had from their politicians for so long.

These people – these neurotic, unhappy people who are constantly seeing 'shrinks' every week: what kind of lives do they lead? The people who are hooked on drugs? I could go on and on and on. They're unhappy people out there, and they want a rescue; they want a hand that will stretch out to rescue them from their meaningless lives, and to join something that means something and is going somewhere, and provides something they've lacked for so long: **a sense of pride in their identity – as White Americans, White Britons, White Germans, French and so on!** (*applause*).

Become active!

I'm one of the older ones here today, but I can say to the younger ones present: If you want a life of meaning and of joy, there's nothing better than becoming an activist in the cause of your race! We can't all be full-time activists, like I am, but being an activist in your spare time can give you that meaning to your life, and you'll never regret it.

And I've never regretted one second of the time I've spent in this struggle – though I've been beaten up, as David Duke said.

Spearhead Support Group

The Spearhead Support Group is a non-party organisation which has been formed for the purpose of promoting the circulation of our magazine – something particularly necessary in view of the rule under which Spearhead is banned from sale or display at British National Party meetings.

The SSG should not be confused with the Friends of Spearhead, which is primarily a fund-raising body. The SSG is independent of any political party and is also independent of Spearhead itself. It is not a part of the Spearhead organisation but is entirely self-regulating. The editor of Spearhead is sympathetic to its aims and appreciative of its support and work but does not regulate its activities.

The SSG does not have a formal membership, with subscriptions, cards, etc. It holds occasional meetings and social activities but its principal function is to serve as a sales agency for the magazine. The SSG is dedicated to the defence and promotion of *genuine racial nationalism* in Britain and is opposed to any liberalising or 'watering-down' tendencies in the nationalist movement.

The SSG can be contacted by writing to PO Box 156, Leeds LS27 8WW. Its e-mail address is: <SpearheadSupportGroup@yahooroups.com>

Read Spearhead on the Internet!

The best articles and news items published in Spearhead in recent months can now be seen on the Spearhead website. You can visit this site at:-

www.spearhead-uk.com

I've been to jail three times. I've been beaten up, and the worst thing of all was that my wife was with me when I was attacked, and she was beaten up too. So we've been through these things, **but it was all worthwhile. It was a thousand times worthwhile. I would never have changed any of it – and it's the life that I recommend to you** (*applause*).

So, I've got to cut things short now, and I'll end with a couple more sentences...

Our people have a choice. We have made that choice. But our nations have a choice. We're lucky to live at a time of great decision, of great destiny, such as befall all great nations at certain key points in their history. We have at that time of destiny the choice of lying down and surrendering, of giving in – or we have the choice of staying and fighting.

But one day we'll be answerable to our grandchildren, and our grandchildren are going to say to us: "When that great time of decision came, what did you do? Did you give in? Or did you fight?"

Are we going to say to them: "Well, the struggle was too severe. The odds were too strong. Perhaps we left it a bit too late. We hadn't a chance, and therefore we lost our country, we lost our nationhood."

Or will we be able to say to them, with pride and honour: **"I was one of those who fought, and there were more and more who came and fought with me. I went out onto the streets and worked and struggled for our cause. We stood firm, like the men of the Alamo, like the men at Rorke's Drift and Blood River. We fought to the bitter end – and we won!"** (*standing ovation*).

* Sam Dickson, the Atlanta lawyer, was one of the other speakers at the conference, who gave an eloquent address.

THE WONDERS of technology enabled me to follow the progress of the recent International European-American Unity and Leadership Conference, held in New Orleans at the end of May, despite it being held thousands of miles away.

It took a good while to listen to the main speeches, but it was a very worthwhile exercise. Interestingly enough, one speaker at the conference reminded us that such technology is mainly the result of the endeavours of Northern Europeans, chiefly British and Germans, and Americans of British and German ancestry.

While there is nothing wrong with a little self-congratulation in a bad time, I intend here mostly to focus on the other side of the coin: on some of our people's weaknesses and stupidities. Paramount and most dangerous of these, I would suggest, is *self-hatred*. A prize example of this very dangerous failing was recently given by *Die Welt*'s UK correspondent Thomas Kielinger.

Herr Kielinger – perhaps covered in sackcloth and ashes – writes that:-

"But as the 60th anniversary of D-Day approaches, I would much rather cut and run from what, in my carefree moments, I consider settled history than ask probing questions about where my country stands before the court of history. Alas, there is nowhere to hide, no peace for the wicked."

The ludicrous nature of this guilt-fest should need no pointing out. Unlike this German, I somehow doubt that many Israelis are flagellating themselves over *their* wickedness in systematically obliterating a hefty part of Gaza, even to the extent of slaughtering most of the animals in the local zoo.

At bottom, isn't this a somewhat wacky *theological* concept, with permanently

UNDERSTANDING OUR WEAKNESS

guilty, evil Germans lining up in a parade of infamy with Arabs, the eternal hijackers and terrorists of the world? What a farce! Why should Germans of the present day bear guilt for alleged atrocities of years ago, especially when many of those allegations rest on 'facts' obtained using the vicious techniques we have seen most recently at Abu Ghraib?

SELF-ABASEMENT

But Kielinger carries on in the same mood of self-abasement: "Time and again you are hit with the compelling presence of other people's heroism and your own country's shame..." Poor Kielinger seems to believe that while the Allies always acted heroically the Germans inevitably behaved shamefully. Of course, this is an absurd viewpoint.

For instance, whatever one's political viewpoint, ideology or nationality, surely the wartime exploits of pilot Hans Ulrich Rudel *did* represent some sort of heroism. Equally, the numerous rapes of little girls perpetrated by some members of the American military in the aftermath of the Battle of the Bulge were certainly not evidence of "other people's heroism!"

But the thoroughly indoctrinated Herr Kielinger may not have encountered such inconvenient items of history, or if he has you can be damned sure that he won't repeat them. Of course, Thomas Kielinger is an

extreme example of the phenomenon of self-hatred, which is nevertheless very common in slightly more subtle forms.

Closely allied with self-hatred is self-deception. We are always instructed by our 'bettters' in the media that certain

Self-guilt, says IAN BUCKLEY, is the one potentially fatal flaw in white western man


countries are completely divorced from reality; they often cite such places as North Korea or Libya. They claim that the people there – or at least the ruling elements – believe that they live in normal societies, when in fact they live in mad ones. Well, I have news for them: it is we who live in the insane society. The media-political élites say, with straight faces, that they are puzzled why electoral turnout has dropped so low, or alternatively why voters are turning to 'extremist' parties. Well, I shall tell them that as well!

Though (as our speaker in New Orleans could have reminded us) modern democracy also is mostly a Northern European invention – one thinks of the old Icelandic *Althing* and the Isle of Man *Tynwald* – there is no real mystery about the ever-diminishing election turnout.

MONEY RULES

As with US politics, the trend in Britain is for the fattest wallets to determine the results of elections. Despite all the show of stupid personal attacks, the two main parties are effectively controlled by the same forces. Party leaders too are subject to approval by secretive bodies of the super-rich, such as the Bilderberg group, just as Blair was in 1993. Assuming a proper leader did by some miracle arise in one of the parties of decay and decadence, this committee would strike him out. Ordinary people can understand this well enough, even if metropolitan broadsheet journalists cannot.

And what do I think of the members of these two main parties who gather at Westminster to enact the wishes of the financial



TERRORIST

Menachem Begin (above) was one of the many men of violence and murder who rose to the top in Israeli politics. He was wined and dined when he came to Britain.

oligarchy? They are the most obnoxious crowd of alleged human beings ever gathered together in one place. How's that?

During the past few weeks, a trial has been taking place in London of the members of the family of the late Omar Sharif (not to be confused with the actor). They, under legislation introduced by the aforesaid 'alleged human beings', are charged with failing to reveal information about a planned terrorist attack *in Israel*. While I do not for a moment agree with the designation of the defendants as 'British', a few points stand out here.

In the first place, the late Mr. Sharif was a completely unsuccessful terrorist who didn't kill anyone, and was found 'dead in the sea' – in English, bumped off by Mossad or Shin Beth. Nothing like a successful, brutal terrorist, as was Lady Thatcher's dining companion, Menachem Begin!

Surely, if we oblige Israel by having this trial, shouldn't they reciprocate by handing over former terrorists from the Irgun or Stern Gang? Some elderly British widows of servicemen killed, wounded or traumatised by these undoubted terrorists, would think that would be a good idea. But in the present world of topsy-turvy power relations there's no chance of this happening. Such women had better get used to enjoying instead the rewards a grateful British Government offers to the kinfolk of those who have served their country well – poverty-level pensions and utility cut-offs,



SEN. HOLLINGS
Says that US foreign policy is decided by Jewish lobby

anyone?

Is the situation any better in America, aside from a select few, most of whom were gathered in New Orleans? At least some influential people are at last finding the courage to speak out, such as the retiring Senator Hollings, who charged that US foreign policy has been made for decades by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), an exceedingly powerful force in US politics.

WHAT MANY ARE AFRAID TO SAY

According to a recent report¹, "Sen. Hollings eloquently stated what many members of Congress believe but are too afraid to say," said one senior Democratic Hill staffer, who spoke on condition of

anonymity. Just smell the fear, folks!

Ultimately, all our the intelligence and skills matter not one whit if we lack the basic understanding of the threats to our survival. I do recommend that readers take another look – after a welter of much more senseless slaughter in Iraq – at the final paragraphs of my earlier article on Professor Kevin Macdonald.

Nor should we be afraid of naming that ultimate threat, now indeed the title of a best-selling book by David Duke: *Jewish Supremacism*, as seen today in Palestine and Iraq, as well as the disgraceful treatment of pacifist Ernst Zundel.

I would like to finish with a quote from Israel Shamir, which sums the whole situation in a nutshell, much as the earlier Macdonald quote did, and do mark well the closing words:-

"... the New World Order of dwindling middle class, vast security apparatus, growing social gap and impoverishment of spirit. It is not the first time the Judaic paradigm rises in the world; but such societies invariably collapse for they lack broad social base. Now its adepts decided to ensure its survival by making it globe-wide; this is the reason of wars and expansion, for their design would not survive on any smaller scale... the spirit of Judaic supremacy which has to be defeated, and it will be defeated."

¹ *JTA News*

http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?strwebhead=Hollings+blasts+AIPAC&intcategoryid=3

MADHOUSE BRITAIN

APPROVAL has been given for the building of a big new 'Gay' Museum in London, which will commemorate the lives of the capital's homosexuals over more than four centuries. Present estimates of costs to taxpayers stand at nearly £30 million – though it is well-known that these projects nearly always far exceed pre-planned budgets.

The idea is the brainchild of 'gay-rights' activist Peter Tatchell and was supported by Labour, Tory, LibDem and Green candidates in the recent London mayoral election.

* * *

GERRY HANSON, a UKIP supporter in Iver Heath, Bucks., put up two party placards each side of his front gate in the run-up to last month's elections. They were removed during the night, and on each occasion for the next three days he replaced them, only to have them removed again.

Mr. Hanson reported the matter to the police, not expecting any action but just as a matter of record. In reply he received a letter from Victim Support, offering sympathy and counselling!

* * *

LAST MONTH it was revealed by the Legal Services Commission that more than 120 firms of solicitors have been overcharging the legal aid

fund for asylum cases.

So far, around £8 million has been recovered, and some contracts have been cancelled. One company claimed £447,000 for work it had never done.

It was also revealed that, at a time when ministers have been insisting that asylum claims are falling, the legal aid budget for dealing with them has increased threefold to over £200 million.

* * *

THE London Muslim Centre, referred to in the press as a 'mega-mosque', opened in the city's East End last month. It was built to hold 10,000 at prayer, but it wasn't big enough to hold all who sought to attend its opening; a further 2,000 worshippers spilled out onto the streets.

The mosque cost £10.4 million to build, with £2.5 million of this coming from the British taxpayer.

The six-storey building, built around the existing East London Mosque, has been described by its managers as 'uniquely British'.

* * *

AN asylum-seeker who persistently stole from shops in a town centre has been told he can stay in Britain.

Mohammed Gaparkhoev, described in a press report as 'Russian' despite his name, was caught thieving in Folkestone, Kent. All he received as court punishment was a two-year ban from the shopping area where he had been operating. Meanwhile he continues to draw £300 a month in benefits while his application for asylum is still being considered – after four years!

It is reported that police and local shop-owners were staggered by this decision.

* * *

BRITISH taxpayers' money is to be spent on counselling services for tribesmen in Afghanistan in order to enable them to get in touch with their 'feminine' side.

Foreign Secretary Jack Straw is backing a plan for psychologists to work with Afghan men who have trouble discussing 'emotional problems'.

In a *Daily Mail* report on June 13th, it was stated: "The controversial scheme is part of a wider New Labour policy to force British diplomats to give a higher priority to 'gender issues'."

* * *

COMMON SENSE, long accepted as an important criterion in court judgements, has now been declared as too subjective a test for multi-cultural Britain because "it means different things to people from different backgrounds." This is part of new guidelines being issued for magistrates in England and Wales by Lord Chancellor Lord Falconer.

THE PROBLEMS of multi-culturalism in Britain are now doing enormous harm to the professional classes. Journalists, priests, politicians and professional specialists of all kinds live in perpetual fear that one of the biggest ideological experiments of all time – getting different races and nationalities to live together in one homeland – will sooner or later break down into vicious sectarianism.

Many parts of the liberal establishment are now becoming extremely uneasy about the reckless and unthinking way in which the Government shows its determination to carry on with its policy of only barely restricted immigration, regardless of what people want or what is in the interests of the nation.

The Government itself, by getting involved in fraudulent immigration scams, is damaging political life, and will lower the quality of aspiring future MPs, attracting only oddballs and traitors.

Town planners, actuaries and demographic experts working at the Office for National Statistics (ONS) and the National Audit Office (NAO) are in danger of having their reputations damaged because of the relentless pressure on them to disguise or gloss over uncomfortable social facts. The ten-year census which social commentators rely on has lost all credibility, since millions do not fill in the census form truthfully.

For similar reasons, writers who make a living out of promoting conspiracy theories alleging that every aspect of our daily lives is being electronically monitored by the 'secret state' are made to look foolish when it is openly acknowledged that the 'Big Brother' authorities have no idea how many tens (or hundreds) of thousands of people illegally enter or leave the country every year. Equally lacking in credibility is the parallel argument that a secret *Illuminati* of global ruling élites are conspiring to set up a one-world police state to rule us all with a rod of iron, since so many migrants around the world are on the move that quite the opposite will soon take place: total racial and cultural anarchy and rampant *intifada*-like lawlessness.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN DARK

For example, even on the local level most authorities now do not know who is living in their boroughs, since the council tax form sent to every household depends upon volunteered information. People drop themselves off the electoral roll, and there is no follow-up check by council officials. The NAO recently said that Labour's figures on immigration and asylum are misleading and highly suspect, with hundreds of thousands of immigrants not accounted for. Researchers say there are no figures, or even estimates, available for illegal immigration, since many entrants are avoiding being counted as asylum-claimants by simply overstaying their work or student visas.

District and county registrars have also been badly affected by illegality. A huge bogus marriage racket is


now in existence, whereby foreigners who have been 'granted' British citizenship can confer permanent domicile rights on thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of yet more foreigners simply by 'marrying' them in a registry office under the gaze of a hapless registry clerk who suspects that he is being drawn into a criminal racket but can do nothing about it.

Illegal positive discrimination in housing, in the medical profession and in police recruitment policies is becoming commonplace. Chief constables are fast-tracking ethnic-minority officers to promotion in a bid to make police forces "more representative of the communities they serve" – which is proof that the police are now focusing on politi-

ally correct ideals rather than enforcing the law without fear or favour. But they are making a great mistake in deploying black officers in multi-racial areas, since race, instead of being downplayed, is actually thereby played up. In addition, the policy hints that black youths have disproportionate criminal tendencies, and can relate only to black officers who have some understanding of these tendencies!

EFFECTS OF WHITE FLIGHT

Housing patterns are becoming seriously distorted nationwide because in some cities white flight has become a self-fulfilling prophecy. The arrival of ethnic minorities in an white area is associated with falling house prices, sparking a mad rush for people to get out



The advertising industry is being 'encouraged' (i.e. pressured) by government agencies such as the Campaign for Racial Equality (CRE) to use more and more black models in its commercials. This one regularly appears in a TV building society advert.

before they lose too much money. But this is seldom commented on by housing economists.

Sociology is no longer a serious investigative subject, since its published output is dominated by politically correct sloganising. The last thing sociologists will do is talk about the number of foreigners living in this country, where they come from and why they have the right to live here permanently.

Journalists also suspect that they are being blatantly manipulated, soviet-style, as when it was revealed in late May that the Home Office was planning a major spin to neutralise 'bad news' about immigration and asylum.

This was an unpleasant example of a highly political strategy to use millions of pounds of taxpayers' money to place 'positive' stories about immigrants with friendly media organisations. Thus the link between media and political élites, as a conspiracy against the British people, was openly revealed by the press itself. Reference was made to a major advertising campaign designed to imply that "immigration is good for Britain." A typical Politburo document was issued with the aim to "communicate the impression of a system under more control," rather than actually to get it under control. "The challenge," we read, "is in finding new ways to package and communicate these issues in a way that makes it easier for people to see the big picture... We need a consistent message in this area."

Similarly, foreign correspondents in the media, who report daily on the growth of rebel movements around the world, along with the never-ending ethnic and tribal warfare everywhere, must somehow imply that Britain is a special case because such tribalism is never likely to occur here, so it'll be perfectly safe to go on letting in the foreign tribes! The Metropolitan Police chiefs in London, constantly issuing hair-raising alarms about possible terrorist attacks in the capital, never for one moment suggest that undocumented and unknown foreigners should not be allowed into the country under any circumstances.

TERRORIST-FRIENDLY LAWYERS

The legal profession now has a negative media image: the image of crooked lawyers trying to prevent terrorists and Islamic racists from being brought to book. Judges are increasingly subjected to politically correct 'guidelines', one of which is that they must avoid using phrases such as 'asylum-seekers' or 'second-generation immigrants' because this is likely to cause offence to such people! Both the terms 'coloured' and 'mixed-race' are considered either offensive or "slightly pejorative."

Sir Bernard Crick was once an esteemed political philosopher and author of a biography of George Orwell. His credibility is now on the line because he used Orwellian phrases such as 'citizenship', and was heard to hurl abuse at Sir Andrew Green and his Migrationwatch organisation. Sir Bernard apparently believes that 'Britishness' is defined nowadays only by political or legal criteria (*the jus soli principle*). In other words, Britain has become a virtual South Africa, where 'Whites', 'Blacks' and 'Coloureds' live together in a single territorial zone that has been stripped of its historic identity. This is despite the fact that every single town and district in the land has been named after British local history, and all have been built by the British themselves.

BLACK M.P.
Diane Abbott
(seen here) got
elected in
London's
Haringey, mainly
by the black vote.
She is a vociferous
hater of white patriots.



Yet the current national dialogue about citizenship is becoming more problematic for the ethnic minorities, not less. Many of them are recent arrivals and speak foreign languages, so cannot join in the debate about continued immigration without some feeling of ambivalence about it. This is the one aspect of life in Britain in which they remain 'excluded'.

And the more immigrants come here to live the more these existential problems will grow and fester. Britain now suffers from glaring, visible incongruities that it didn't have some 30 years ago: different races, many wearing traditional attire, can be seen strolling about British suburban streets, looking as if they are going to a fancy-dress party. This madness arises from the schizoid notion of 'multiple identities'.

RACE IS ABOUT NATIONAL ORIGINS

But there is nothing 'multiple' about race. Race indicates national origins, and this is why the rules are frequently changing in order to get round the problem or to avoid embarrassment or hurt to people's feelings. Black people don't do themselves any favours by voting for black MPs just because they cannot identify with the white (i.e. indigenous British) ones. This raises the awkward question of why they bothered migrating here at all, and whether they truly believe that Britishness is a race-free concept. On the other hand, many Blacks, wanting to enjoy the fruits of white western civilisation (but not being able to create it themselves), want to live amongst white people and become honorary Whites. The black TV broadcaster clearly gets more status by broadcasting in a white society than he would in a black society!

There is still no final arbiter on this wretched matter, since no community – the indigenous or the *diaspora* – has decided how Britain is to be defined. At the moment it is the white British themselves who are changing the rules on an *ad hoc* basis – sometimes Britain is a multicultural, sometimes a multi-racial and sometimes a multiple-identity country.

But we must be forewarned. A mixed-up society like Britain cannot function satisfactorily without becoming *more authoritarian*, because there will be an obvious need to repress or contain cultural tensions, and to brainwash and indoctrinate people. Unless there is drastic change, life in Britain will be exceedingly unpleasant in the future.

IN HIS BOOK, *Rogue State*, William Blum catalogues American crimes against scores of nations around the world. These crimes very often involve the overthrow of legally constituted governments and the installing of the Americans' own creatures in power, as well as training their military and police personnel in all the methods of repression to keep them there, including assassination, torture and terror.

For this reason we can truthfully and accurately describe America as a terrorist state. This is no wild exaggeration. The *American Heritage Dictionary* defines terrorism as "the political use of terror and intimidation." To take one tiny example out of hundreds, from the Philippines to Lebanon and from Portugal to Vietnam, we will consider Yugoslavia. Kosovo had been a part of Serbia for centuries but the Americans didn't like Slobodan Milosevic's policy of trying to keep this region in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Also, the Serbs had shown no enthusiasm for joining the New World Order club of globalised American partners. After 33 days of unrelenting and remorseless bombing and missile attacks destroying homes, villages, schools, hospitals and public utilities like water works and bridges, killing and maiming countless people, the then President Bill Clinton declared: "This may seem like a long time... I don't think this air campaign has been going on a particularly long time" (*Washington Post*, 25.4.99). So he continued it for a further 44 days, reducing a modern civilised nation to a state of chaos, doing billions of pounds of damage and murdering yet more thousands of people. Then to crown it all, the US Government had the effrontery to put Milosevic on trial for 'crimes against humanity'. Such behaviour reinforces the conviction of some that we live in a giant world lunatic asylum and that the worst lunatics have taken it over.

The US Government and its evil CIA care no more for their own military personnel and citizenry than they do for the people of Yugoslavia or Iraq. They poisoned thousands of their own soldiers and airmen in Vietnam with the deadly dioxin-based pesticide Agent Orange. Dioxin is as toxic as nerve gas, highly carcinogenic and the cause of numerous diseases, including reproductive abnormalities. Not only did many US servicemen suffer horrible diseases but many of their offspring were born handicapped and deformed. Some five hundred pounds of dioxin were used in Vietnam, affecting an estimated two million people. The use of a whole cocktail of injections; exposure to radio-active dust generated by their armour-piercing uranium-tipped projectiles; and the policy of bombing Iraq's weapons dumps poisoned well over two hundred thousand US military personnel. This is not to mention the legacy of increased cancers and leukaemia among the people of Iraq, especially children. Gulf Syndrome is a term now entered into medical dictionaries.

TERRORISM AND CRIMINALITY IN HIGH PLACES

A look behind the scenes of 20th and 21st century politics by RICHARD PORTER

It is also well documented that the US Government has conducted numerous tests on large sections of its own population, without the latter's consent, using biological, chemical and radio-active material. The results of these tests, in terms of human suffering and disease, will probably never be known. It is clear that the sub-humans who stand behind the US Government and are responsible for its global policies of murder and mayhem are not just malevolent and evil: they are satanic.

There is a mass of evidence that the CIA has been heavily involved in drug-running and laundering drug money. Indeed Blum gives details of how the Agency set up its own bank for the purpose. It seems CIA operatives used drug money to finance some of their more shady operations round the world. Denis Doyle, a former chief of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), declared: "In my 50-year history in the Drug Enforcement Administration and related agencies, the major targets of my investigations almost invariably turned out to be working for the CIA."

CIA importing drugs

So we are faced with the extraordinary enigma of the American CIA and its agents importing hard drugs like cocaine and opium into the United States: drugs which are wrecking countless lives and destroying the youth of America, while other agencies of the same Government spare no effort to track down and prosecute drug offenders. Blum gives numerous examples of CIA operatives getting off the hook for drug-running. America is becoming an increasingly oppressive and dictatorial society with 'phones, e-mail and letters being pried into and unexpected raids and searches carried out on ordinary citizens. All the magic of electronic gadgetry and modern surveillance is being used to spy on America and to keep the population under control.

American prisons are notorious for their appalling and barbaric treatment of prisoners, many of whom are innocent victims of FBI frame-ups. Beatings, rape and solitary are regular occurrences in these prisons. If Americans treat their own like this what can Iraqis expect?

How does one explain all of this? The answer is simple enough. The Government of the United States and its military and various so-called security agencies like the

CIA, FBI and SWAT have all been hijacked at the top by an alien clique who have no loyalty to traditional America. They are working to their own agenda. Their plan is no less than the destruction of White Christian America and its conversion into a racial mélange of compliant slaves of the New World Order, whose every need will be provided by de-vitaminised, de-mineralised and chemically dosed supermarket junk foods, canned entertainment liberally spiced with soul-destroying propaganda and a debased and debauched 'sport'.

The CIA and satanism

Of all the CIA's evil operations, one of the most shadowy and nefarious is its involvement in satanic cults, its trading in women and children for sex and its research into mind-control. I refer to the so-called MKULTRA project (Manufacturing Killers Utilising Lethal Tradecraft Requiring Assassinations). This involves the use of mind-bending drugs, torture and hypnosis, to turn people into compliant assassins and sex-objects. Consult *Secret Societies and Psychological Warfare*, by Michael Hoffman. One of the subjects of these mind-control techniques, a certain K. Sullivan, claims she was made a whore and was abused by the likes of George Bush, Henry Kissinger, Robert Maxwell and Billy Graham. (*The Franklin Cover-up*, by John Decamp). Of course, Billy Graham has been canonised by the evangelical branch of the so called 'Christian Church'. These people view the man as a saint who can do no wrong.

But things are often not what they seem, and Billy Graham is certainly not what he appears to be. A friend of mine has done a lot of research on the famous evangelist. Billy is a 33rd degree Freemason. That's about as high as you can go. Jim Shaw, a 33rd degree Mason who defected from freemasonry, describes how Billy and former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower were present at his (Shaw's) initiation (See *The Deadly Deception*, by McKenny and Shaw). The writers later confirmed that the publisher refused to print the book unless these names were withdrawn.

The Billy Graham Evangelistic Association at first denied that Billy had had anything to do with Masonry. In view of the evidence, they finally admitted that he attended a 33rd Degree rite in 1966 but was never a Mason. They continue to lie, although 'Cutting Edge' website has reported

that two official freemasonry websites had both listed Billy as a famous Mason. 'Cutting Edge' reported: "If Mr Graham is a free-mason, then the faith in him and his ministry is misplaced, to say the least." Note: nobody is allowed to attend masonic rituals except fellow freemasons. Only 33rd degree freemasons would be allowed to attend the initiation of a 33rd degree mason. The lower degrees of masonry, with their high-sounding principles, are nothing but a charade to disguise its real goals.

In 1982, Billy Graham, already a multi-millionaire, was awarded the Templeton Prize for 'progress in religion'. This award is the highest-paid in the world, at an estimated one million US dollars. In return, Billy has endorsed books written by Sir John Marks Templeton which promote occultist teaching contradicting basic New Testament teaching.

In 1969, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith awarded Billy the 'The Torch of Liberty Plaque'. This is Luciferian/Illuminati symbolism, for "the torches represent the occult arts and sciences," according to Luciferian 33rd Degree Freemason, Manly Palmer Hall. B'nai B'rith is blatantly anti-Christian, so how come it honours the world's leading Christian evangelist with its highest award?

Graham's full name is Billy Frank Graham. Some claim he has had a name change and that his real family name is Frank. He named his son Franklin. A famous member of this line was Jakob Frank, a self-confessed Satanist whose followers were called 'Frankists'. Freud's sexually-obsessed theories came from Frankism. Frank taught his followers to convert to another religion and hide behind that religion to conceal their Satanism.

Perhaps Harry S. Truman was right after all when he described Graham as "counterfeit" and a publicity-seeker. George Bush, Bill Clinton and Jimmy Carter have all been praised to the skies by close friend Billy. He has thus endorsed their insane policies, like race-mixing, bombing the hell out of other nations and pro-abortion and pro-homosexual policies.

British Intelligence controlled from Russia

For many years British Intelligence has worked in close collaboration with the American CIA and Israeli Mossad. Before World War II under Neville Chamberlain, the counter-espionage services of MI5 and MI6 were directed against Communism as the main enemy. Almost immediately after becoming Prime Minister, Winston Churchill sacked the founding father of the internal security services, Sir Vernon Kell, and by degrees packed MI5 and MI6 with communist sympathisers. A Soviet booklet titled *Russia's Enemies in Britain* devoted 39 of its 70 pages to attacking a certain Kenneth De Courcy. De Courcy had worked on the editorial board of a publication called *Intelli-*

gence Digest, which exposed Victor Rothschild, a member of the powerful banking family, who had joined MI5 at the outbreak of the war, as "the patron of the Russian group of spies." Victor Rothschild recruited large numbers of disaffected students at Oxford and Cambridge Universities to act as Soviet agents. Many of these later joined MI5 and MI6, so that under Churchill and for many years following the British Security Service was no more than a branch of the Soviet KGB. Thanks to Churchill and his close friend Rothschild, communists and/or homosexuals virtually controlled MI5 and MI6. We can name just a few of these: Roger Hollis, in 1940 Assistant Director of 'F' Division, monitoring 'extremist' political parties, and later promoted to head of British Intelligence; Guy Liddell, under whose auspices known traitors like Blunt and Burgess entered service; Maxwell Knight, and a host of several others.

Harold Wilson, Soviet Agent

In her book *Enemies of the Queen* the late Dr. Kitty Little revealed that from the very beginning Harold Wilson was a communist agent secretly working for the destruction of Britain and the establishment of a Marxist one-world government. She described how, as a young student, she was invited to Wilson's room at University



HAROLD WILSON
Was he a Communist agent?

College, Oxford, in the summer of 1940, when he (Wilson) attempted to recruit her into his organisation. He told her that he was the 'political head' of the organisation whose aim was to infiltrate the political parties at the top and work to destroy traditional Britain. Wilson informed her that the man in charge of the whole organisation was "the head of the Biological Section," whom he didn't name. We do not have to guess very hard to know exactly who this was. When Wilson later

became Prime Minister, he was investigated by MI5 and cleared, but it was later discovered that the head of British Intelligence, Roger Hollis, was himself a Soviet agent. So the British Government of the time was headed by a Soviet agent and so was British Intelligence!

It cannot be without significance that Wilson took over the leadership of the Labour Party with the sudden and unexpected death of Hugh Gaitskell on January 18th 1963, aged 56. Wilson became Prime Minister in 1964-1970 and 1974-1976. Likewise, Tony Blair, a political nobody, was appointed leader of the party upon the sudden death of John Smith, due to a heart condition – or so we have been told. According to one-time top KGB agent, Anatoly Golitsyn in his book *The Perestroika Deception*, British Intelligence has been heavily infiltrated by the Soviet KGB, and they (the KGB) planned "the victory of the Labour Party in the national elections in Britain in the 1990s." For years, all leading Labourites were members of the Fabian Society, whose policy of change by stealth and deception is embodied in its emblem of a wolf in sheep's clothing.

It would be interesting to know just how much of so-called 'British' Government policy over the years was formulated in Moscow. The race laws certainly were. The first Race Relations Bill was introduced into the House of Commons by the Labour Attorney General, the immigrant Jew from Russia, Sir Frank Soskice, in 1965. Soskice was the son of Kerensky's private secretary. It was Kerensky (real name Aaron Kirbitz) who handed over the 1917 revolution in Russia, after the overthrow of the Tsar's Government, to Lenin and Trotsky. According to Harold Wallace Rosenthal, in his *Confessions*, all the main policies pursued by western governments were formulated in Moscow and Israel.

Some now spell Tony Blair's name 'Blair', encapsulating the character of the man. An Australian friend simply labelled him "Bloody Bastard Barrister Blair." In considering political tools and sycophants like Wilson, Blair, Thatcher, Heath and the whole rotten crew, we should remember this remarkable statement in the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*:

"The leaders whom we shall choose from amongst the people with strict regard for their capacity for servile obedience will not be people trained in the art of government, so they will be easy pawns in our game in the hands of men of experience who will be their advisers."

We should also remember the words of Jesus: "Beware of wolves in sheep's clothing."

Read: How You Have Been Deceived, free booklet from Richard Porter, PO Box 88, Stowmarket, Suffolk IP14 1EE (send stamp for post only).

Playing the numbers game

IT IS very noticeable that those who seek to destroy the racial basis of British Nationalism are now playing the 'numbers game'. Recent BNP election literature made much of the fact that we were being swamped by asylum-seekers, most of them bogus, and that even Asian and black Londoners(!) were angry about the asylum situation.

All this is true. Bogus asylum refugee arrivals and applications are reaching pandemic proportions, and Asian and black immigrants in Britain and their descendants may well be fearful of this new tide sweeping into the country. This is a list for the year 2000 of the countries where officially declared asylum-seekers came from: (1) Afghanistan; (2) Iraq; (3) Somalia; (4) Sri Lanka; (5) Turkey; (6) Iran; (7) Yugoslavia; (8) Pakistan; (9) China; (10) Zimbabwe. I have no reason to believe that the situation is much different this year, apart from the fact that the numbers will be much greater.

Look, however, at these top ten countries of origin. Only one is European: Yugoslavia, and even then most of these 'Yugoslavs' are not Serbs or Croats but Kosovans and Albanians, with a wholly different ethnic background to the Slavic peoples. They are also for the most part Muslim.

OK, so the BNP/UKIP/English Democrats and all the rest of the new populists playing down race and playing up numbers are making a valid point. *But* they are also (perhaps purposely) disguising the real issue. The greater percentage of asylum-seekers are not what could be termed 'European stock'.

BACKTRACKERS' ARGUMENT

Asylum-seekers are mostly just another form of massed non-white immigrants, adding to the huge Asian/black population already here. The message then that is going across to the British public from these backtrackers is: "Non-European immigrants already here are OK because the main problem is that of asylum-seekers, and that problem is one not of race but of sheer numbers."

The numbers coming in do matter, and have to be added to the continuous problem of 'normal' non-white immigration, which is now conveniently overlooked in the furore over asylum-seekers.

But let's put the matter straight. The asylum flood is just another stage in the ongoing mass immigration of large portions of the non-white Third World, which has been going on apace since the 1950s. The

Ugandan Asian influx; the Vietnamese boat people; the Hong Kong Chinese – all were in their time described in very similar terms to the way both the tabloid media and the 'nationalist' opposition are now describing

Just because the quantity of immigrants is important, says EDDY MORRISON, we should not forget that the key issue is still that of race

the asylum-seeker crisis.

There is good propaganda to be made from highlighting the asylum-seeker flood; but to ignore the racial factor is to miss the point entirely. Britain and the White World are under threat from a vast flood of non-Europeans. The situation is now close to the horrific scenario described by Jean Raspail in his masterful work *The Camp of the Saints*, which every white nationalist should have on his or her bookshelf.

The racial problem is being played down and the numbers played up, whereas they are both one and the same problem. Why? To escape the heinous charge of 'racism'. This is dishonest, and, as I have said, totally misleading to the people of Britain and also to our non-white resident population. They are being told that repatriation is now out of the

question and that they are here and welcome to stay. Presumably, after a few years when a new immigration threat rises up and the asylum-seeker hubbub has passed, these very same asylum-seekers will be told they are not a threat because masses of (*fill in the blank!*) immigrants from another Third World area are poised to come into Europe in their millions.

HALT TO IMMIGRATION NOT ENOUGH

Even if the floodgates were shut and not one single non-European immigrant entered Britain again, we would still be faced with a massive racial problem (no, Mr. Griffin, not an Islamic problem but a *racial* one).

We must grasp the nettle as white nationalists. If we wish to keep our own unique white identity and heritage we cannot assimilate these people – even if we, or they for that matter, wanted to be integrated. Our backgrounds and cultures are poles apart, and we know from history the damage that full-scale miscegenation can do to all races involved. Multi-racial integration brings violence, misery and bewilderment to all peoples, irrespective of their race.

Stopping immigration because of the 'numbers' just isn't enough. Voluntary repatriation isn't enough. The only thing that will solve the long-term racial crisis in this country, is a policy of commonsense repatriation of *all* non-European immigrants and their descendants and dependants back to the countries of their origin. This must be carefully planned and managed in a humane way, based on the understanding that it is the only sensible way to *stop* racial hatred, which is endemic in Britain in every ethnic group. You cannot stop racial strife by draconian legislation to cover up the gross mistakes caused by mass immigration. Only an orderly and peaceful *separation* of the diverse racial groups in the UK can restore racial harmony.

Racialism is not a word to be frightened of but in fact covers the only answer to the mess of multi-racialism. Racialism does not cause violence, hatred or terror: *multi-racialism* causes them. The proponents of multi-racialism are the real promoters of hatred; and we, the much-maligned 'racists', are the proponents of racial tolerance based on the historical principle of separate development for all races.

The numbers-game players think they are being very clever in taking the race issue out of the immigration problem, but in the end they are fooling only themselves.



NOT JUST A QUESTION OF NUMBERS
These would-be immigrants from Somalia belong to a totally different race and cannot be assimilated within the British population if we are to retain any national identity of our own.

UNTIL very recently, tracing your own genealogy back through the years was a time-consuming and fairly difficult activity. To be sure, various useful sources were available, such as parish registers and trade and area directories. Those who lived in or near London could consult the mass of records – beginning in 1837 – at St. Catherine's House.

The services of a professional genealogist might be used by those who could afford their help. Even so, one would be quite lucky to get beyond six or seven generations; but the modern development of the Internet has come to aid of folk who would like to learn the names and lives of their ancestors.

By using this aid, I managed to trace my ancestry back many hundred of years. If anyone would like to emulate my quest, then I suggest that the first step of all is to listen to any old relatives who have tales to tell about such things. From such sources, I already suspected that one line might be easier to trace: that of a paternal

ON THE FASCINATION OF FAMILY TREES

great-grandmother, the Harolds. There are several monuments and a carved wooden crest commemorating this Anglo-Irish family in St. Mary's Cathedral, Limerick.

On one Internet forum I noticed that an American was asking for details of the Harold family in Liverpool during the 19th and early 20th centuries: he turned out to be my third cousin. From him I discovered the name of my great great grandmother, Elizabeth Emma Bold, who was married to William Harold. By the way, I was still investigating my other ancestors of the same generation, but while they were all solid citizens of the type who kept the old Britain going – a district inspector of police, a shipping clerk, a colliery winder and a builder, for example – there seemed little chance of going any further back with their lineage.

BUILDERS

But it was to be very different with Elizabeth Emma Bold. She was the youngest daughter of the family that built Bold Hall in Lancashire. Another member of the family was Jonas Bold, a Lord Mayor of Liverpool, after whom Bold Street in Liverpool was named.

Through the detailed and clear charts on Gordon Bold's website, I found that the earliest member of the family recorded was William de Bold in 1129. Gordon, author of a book on the complex history of the Bold family, formerly lived in Rhodesia and South Africa but is now resident in Australia. The Bold family motto '*Nil Desperandum*' (never give up) may seem peculiarly suitable in days such as these. In spite of the radio talk-show trash of "We are all incomers from every part of the world," William de Bold had lived within a twenty-mile radius of me!

Even more interesting was to trace the line back to my (11 greats) grandparents Richard Bold (born in 1588) and Anne Legh. Anne's grandfather, Piers Legh, was the original builder of Lyme Hall in Cheshire. The land where Lyme stands was granted by the King as a reward for the gallantry of an earlier family member who rescued the Black Prince's standard at Caen. One can see that here at least, by contrast with the eighteenth century and after, there was a *real* aristocracy of strength and courage, as opposed to the fake version fattened by trade and commerce.

Anne's grandmother, married to Sir Piers,

was Ellen Savage, sister of an Archbishop of Canterbury. Ellen's maternal grandfather was Thomas Stanley, of the family who were Lords of the Isle of Man and later Earls of Derby. But it was on her mother's side that the search became a touch mind-boggling.

MANY WITH ROYAL BLOOD

In parenthesis, it should be said that descents from the medieval English monarchs are by no means all that rare. Just about every US president was descended from such Kings, as indeed was the 'tough guy' Hollywood actor Humphrey Bogart. The early Plantagenets were in an almost literal sense the fathers of their country – around a quarter of million people in Britain, the US, Canada, South Africa and Australia have such ancestors.

So it was with Thomas Stanley's wife Joan Goushill, who was a descendant twice over of the Plantagenet royal family, most notably King Edward I, Edward Longshanks. From Edward, of course, the line went back to the Anglo-Saxon kings and Alfred the Great.

By other strands of ancestry, Joan descended from William Marshal, the Regent of England, and Richard Strongbow, the conqueror of Ireland. By her great-great grandmother Blanche, Joan descended from the French royal house, including Charlemagne and Charles Martel, the defender of Poitiers.

The line snaked back through the houses of France, Navarre and Castille to Rodrigo Diaz, Count de Bivar, *el Cid*, the national hero of Spain. *El Cid*, the medieval world's quintessential man of honour, ensured victory over the Moors at the battle of Valencia by riding out half-dead on his horse at the head of his men. Some may remember the film depiction of this scene with Charlton Heston as the Cid.

In conclusion, it should be stated that none of the foregoing is written in a boastful spirit – everyone of us has eight great grandparents, 16 great great grandparents, and so on – and plenty of mine will have been totally obscure farmers, labourers and fishermen and none the worse for that. It is intended more in the hope that others will follow my example and re-discover pride in their people and ancestors. Genes are important. Only by recognising this can we find the way to rebuild our wrecked country!

IAN BUCKLEY

JOHN WILHELMY

Listen to nationalist radio!
Send International Reply Coupon
for broadcast details to:-
NATIONAL VANGUARD BOOKS,
Box 330, Hillsboro, WV 24946,
U.S.A.
Internet: www.natvan.com &
www.natall.com

FRIENDS OF SPEARHEAD

Friends of Spearhead is a support group that has been formed for the purpose of ensuring our magazine's continued survival.

Members of Friends of Spearhead pay a subscription of a minimum of £10 a month, in return for which they may, if they wish, receive five copies of each monthly issue for redistribution (by whatever means they prefer). This subscription may be paid by cheque or direct debit, in which case our bank details will be supplied.

In addition, Friends of Spearhead undertakes certain other promotions, details of which are advertised as they occur.

We hope very much that our readers and supporters, not only in the UK but around the world, will rally to help us in this project.

Friends of Spearhead can be contacted at PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT.

FOR more than 40 years, the company founded and built by Walt Disney offered popular, well-crafted entertainment that upheld American values and traditions. Its films and television programming – even if sometimes sugary – epitomised, to use the much-mocked phrase, wholesome family entertainment. It was the work largely of one man, Walter Elias Disney (1901- 1966), a gifted illustrator, brilliant film-maker and genial entrepreneur who left a lasting mark on American popular culture. His cartoon characters, animated films, and amusement parks, are recognised around the world.

In 1928 he launched the beloved Mickey Mouse character in an animated film, *Steamboat Willie*, that became an immediate hit. In the decades that followed, Disney dominated animation art with such innovative and hugely popular films as *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* (1937), *Pinocchio* (1940), *Fantasia* (1940) and *Bambi* (1942). He also oversaw the production of such enduring feature films as *Treasure Island* (1950), *Robin Hood* (1952), *20,000 Leagues Under the Sea* (1954), *The Swiss Family Robinson* (1960), *The Absent-Minded Professor* (1960) and *Mary Poppins* (1964).

Politically conservative and ardently anti-communist, the hard-working Disney was habitually involved in every stage of production and management. He and his work were honoured with 39 Academy Awards, and hundreds of other awards and tributes.

Under New Management

A period of stagnation that followed the founder's death came to an end in September 1984 when Michael Eisner became the Disney Company's Chairman and Chief Executive Officer. Eisner moved quickly to install fellow Jews in top positions throughout the Disney operation, and soon Hollywood's last Gentile-run studio passed into Jewish hands.

As media critic Michael Medved has pointed out, "The famous Disney organisation, which was founded by Walt Disney, a Gentile Mid-Westerner who allegedly harboured anti-Semitic attitudes, now features Jewish personnel in nearly all its most powerful positions." ('Jews Run Hollywood. So What?', *Moment* magazine, August 1996). Under the new management, Disney company sales and profits soared, and the revitalised company reclaimed a leading place in the entertainment world.

With its acquisition in 1995 of Capital Cities/ABC, Disney became the world's largest entertainment company. The Walt Disney Company today is a sprawling and highly profitable international business empire (revenue for fiscal year 1998 was \$23 billion, and net income \$1.9 billion). With major holdings in film, television, radio and publishing, the company has a tremendous impact on the mindset and behaviour of hundreds of millions around the globe.

Through Walt Disney Pictures (headed by Joe Roth), Touchstone Pictures, Hollywood Pictures, Miramax (run by the Weinstein brothers) and Caravan Pictures, it is

Kingdom' amusement park in Southern California, opened by Walt Disney in 1955 – the company today owns Disney World (Florida), Epcot Center, Tokyo Disneyland and Euro Disney (France), as well as the 'Mighty Ducks' hockey team and the 'Anaheim Angels' baseball team. Each year Disney also sells well over a billion dollars worth of consumer products – toys, books and clothing – through more than 500 Disney stores.

Wealthy and Machiavellian

Michael D. Eisner, born in 1942 into a well-to-do Jewish family, was raised on Manhattan's Upper East Side and educated in private schools. His father was a Harvard lawyer who served as a high-ranking official in President Eisenhower's administration.

As Disney Chairman, Eisner has been fabulously – some might say obscenely – compensated. His annual base salary of \$750,000 is only a small portion of his Disney income, which is mostly from stock option profits. In 1993, for example, Eisner's total compensation was a staggering \$203 million, while in 1997 he exercised options on 21.9 million shares for a profit of \$550 million.

Since 1984, Chairman Eisner has received nearly \$1 billion from Disney, including base salary, bonuses, and stock options (*Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 4, 1997). In January 1997 he signed a ten-year extension contract with the company valued at some \$200 million.

Eisner has cultivated a public image of himself as friendly, trustworthy and even boyish. But those who know him well regard him as treacherous and machiavellian. David Geffen, a fellow Hollywood mogul who has known Eisner well for years, said of him in a 1995 interview: "Michael is a liar, and anyone who has dealt with him, genuinely dealt with him, knows he's a liar."

Cultural Revolution

Since 1984, Michael Eisner and his colleagues have refashioned Hollywood's most culturally conservative and family-oriented studio into one of its most culturally seditious and anti-traditional. In doing so, they betrayed the founder's legacy, degraded his values and demeaned the company's defining spirit.

Under Eisner's direction, the Disney company has turned out motion pictures packed with graphic violence and killing (such as *Pulp Fiction*), as well as rock music albums loaded with gross obscenities (such as *Insane Clown Posse*, by 'The Great Malenko' hip-hop band).

Even *Commentary*, the magazine of the American Jewish Committee (March 1998), was moved to lament: "If the old Disney tells us something inspiring about who we were not so very long ago, the new and even more hugely lucrative Disney is just another signpost marking our long, steep cultural descent."

While support for homosexuals has been widespread in Hollywood for years,

The subversion of Disney

MARK WEBER relates what happened when the famous film company was taken over by the Michael Eisner gang

one of the world's largest film producers and distributors. Through the 1995 merger, Disney acquired the ABC Television network, which owns ten television



DISNEY

A true creative artist and provider of wholesome family entertainment

stations outright. It also has 225 affiliated TV stations in the United States, and is part owner of several European television companies. Among its other TV holdings are Walt Disney Television, Touchstone Television and Buena Vista Television. Disney also controls three major cable television networks with more than 100 million subscribers: ESPN (headed by Steven Bornstein), Lifetime Television and Arts & Entertainment (A&E and the History Channel).

Through its 1995 ABC acquisition, Disney owns 26 AM and FM radio stations, and has more than 3,300 ABC radio affiliates. The company also owns daily newspapers and glossy consumer magazines (including *Discover*) and Hyperion Press book publishers.

In addition to Disneyland – the 'Magic

under Eisner the Disney Company – in the words of the American Family Association – has become “one of the leading promoters of the homosexual lifestyle, as well as the homosexual political and social agenda in America today.” Eisner himself is a board member of ‘Hollywood Supporters’, an influential and aggressive homosexual advocacy organisation. The Disney company advertises in homosexual publications such as *Out* magazine, and has given financial support to at least one benefit for the ‘National Gay and Lesbian Task Force’.

In 1996, actress Ellen DeGeneres ‘came out’ as openly homosexual, both personally and as the lead character in the *Ellen* sitcom series, broadcast on the Eisner-controlled ABC television network. Eisner introduced insurance benefits for same-gender partners of Disney’s homosexual employees. For some years now, he has sanctioned ‘Gay Day’ at Disney World, an event that each year draws throngs of boisterous ‘in-your-face’ homosexuals.

“In the interest of full disclosure,” quipped *Boston Herald* columnist Don Feder, “Disney should change its corporate logo to show a pink triangle flying over Cinderella’s castle.” He went on to refer to Disneyland as “The Magic Kink-dom.”

Assault Against Christianity

Under Eisner, the Disney company has waged a ‘cultural war’ against Christianity, scorning the religious sensibilities of the vast majority of Americans.

In a 1995 statement, the American Catholic Lawyers Association indignantly declared:-

“We all remember the Disney Company from the days when it produced films your children could actually watch without losing their innocence – films which showed a decent respect for Christianity and Christian values. But that was before Mr. Michael Eisner took the helm of the Disney conglomerate. Now the Disney Company has joined the rest of Hollywood in obsessively attacking the Catholic Church and pumping R-rated filth into our culture – under cover of its subsidiary, Miramax Films, whose co-chairmen are Bob and Harvey Weinstein.

“A particularly offensive example of the Eisner/Disney assault is *Priest*, a 1995 motion picture released by the company’s Miramax subsidiary. It tells the story of four Roman Catholic clergy-men: one is homosexual, another is also holic, a third has a mistress, and the fourth is insane.”

One of the strongest voices protesting this movie, and Disney’s anti-Christian productions generally, has been that of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, a New York-based civil rights organisation. “*Priest*,” said League President William Donahue, “displays the most profound hostility to the Catholic Church that I have seen in the last 15 years of reviewing movies.” Eisner, Donahue added, would never approve a film that similarly portrays depraved Jewish rabbis or morally bankrupt homosexuals, or which contains

EISNER
He turned the
Disney
empire into a pur-
veyor of filth and
degeneracy



cruel caricatures of African-Americans.

Reflecting the Zionist sentiments of its top management, the Eisner-run Disney Company has produced a number of anti-Arab motion pictures in recent years. In a 1994 movie, *The Return of Jafar*, for example, hook-nosed Arabs are referred to as “desert skunks.” *The Father of the Bride, Part II* (1995), includes a loathsome Arab-American character named Habib (played, ironically, by Eugene Levy). *Kazaam* (1996), produced by Disney’s Touchstone pictures, includes an assortment of villainous Arab characters, including a black marketer named Malik. Other recent anti-Arab Disney films include *In the Army Now* and *Gl Jane*.

In August 1996 the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee organised a demonstration outside the Disney studios to protest the company’s pattern of anti-Arab productions.

White America Under Fire

For some years now, Hollywood and American television have churned out numerous films and television productions that distort European-American history and disparage white America’s racial-cultural heritage. Under Eisner, Disney has moved to the forefront of this ‘politically correct’ assault.

Among the recent Disney films that misrepresent and malign America’s European heritage has been *Pocahontas*, a 1995 animated film that portrays Indians (‘Native Americans’) as liberated, nature-loving, wise and noble, while depicting Europeans as narrow-minded, ignorant, bigoted and greedy. Under the ‘Hollywood Records’ label, Eisner/Disney has issued CD albums with anti-white lyrics, including one by black rap singer ‘Prince Akeem’, who blames black poverty on a “white conspiracy.” In April 1996 Eisner fired New York City’s most popular radio talk-show host, Bob Grant, from his job at Disney-owned WABC for allegedly white racist rhetoric.

Some of the millions of Americans whom Eisner and his colleagues have affronted are fighting back. Most notably, the nation’s two largest Christian groups – the Roman Catholics and the Southern Baptists – have declared ‘economic war’ against Eisner/Disney.

In 1996 the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights announced a “nationwide charge against Disney, making use of every legal means available – from boycotts to stockholder revolts,” to pressure the company into ending its

hostility to Christianity and Catholicism. Roman Catholic dioceses across the country and the Catholic fraternal association Knights of Columbus sold off millions of dollars in Disney stock.

The Southern Baptists – with 16 million members, the largest Protestant denomination in the United States – voted overwhelmingly in 1996 and again in 1997 to boycott Disney films and products. The group cited the company’s trashing of traditional and family values, and in particular its support for homosexuality.

The Assemblies of God Church – an evangelical Christian denomination with 2.5 million members – launched its own anti-Disney boycott campaign in 1996. It criticised the company for “abandoning the commitment to strong moral values.”

Such boycott efforts seem to have had little lasting impact, however, because Disney Company products and services are so widely available, often under non-Disney labels, because pre-Eisner Disney images are still so beloved, and, more generally, because of public apathy.

Seductive and Dangerous

Because Eisner and the others who run the motion picture and television industries are able to shape the public’s barely conscious basic assumptions about life and society, thereby profoundly influencing the thinking and actions of millions, they wield greater power than even our elected lawmakers.

A lust for profits does not adequately explain the social-cultural agenda of Eisner and the others who control the American media. Rather, they seem driven by priorities that are fundamentally hostile to this nation’s most vital traditions and basic values.

Precisely because the Eisners of Hollywood and New York beguilingly pose as friends, they are more insidious, and ultimately more dangerous, than even a military threat from a foreign power.

Eisner’s transformation of Disney parallels, and contributes to, the cultural, social and political transformation of the United States as a whole. Like America’s political leaders, Eisner and his Disney colleagues reassuringly display familiar symbols and trademarks from an earlier era, exploiting reputations and goodwill painstakingly built up over decades. Those who patronise Disney are reassured that such beloved symbols as Micky Mouse and Snow White are still in place, just as millions of credulous Americans are reassured about the future of the United States because such icons as the American Flag and the US Constitution are still in place.

But in each case the spirit that gave life to these venerable symbols has been driven out by a very different one – a spirit that has not yet dared to show its real face, or speak its real name.

The writer of this article, Mark Weber, is the director of the California-based Institute for Historical View. He can be reached at: www.ihr.org/jhr/v17/v17n5p10_Weber.html



The Editor
'Spearhead'
PO Box 2471
Hove
E. Sussex BN3 4DT

SIR: The UK Independence Party, as constantly quoted in the mass media, is claiming to be the 'only' party campaigning for withdrawal from the European Union. Such duplicity is clearly designed to divert attention and support from the BNP, which has been plugging this policy for decades now. We can only rejoice at the discomfiture of the main political parties in the face of UKIP's recent success in the polls, but let no one imagine that casting votes for the UKIP is enough to ensure Britain's survival as a recognizable and fully independent nation-state.

National identity is rooted in racial ancestry, so in the assertion of its 'multi-culti' credentials the UKIP's patriotism is seen to be fundamentally fraudulent.

What price disengaging from Europe while becoming a Third World colony? Come on, given the choice, who would choose the latter? And how could anyone describe Britain as a 'United Kingdom' when it is already well down the road towards a balkanised future, and local councils forbid display of the national flag? Let's face it, the UKIP is no more than a safety net for the Westminster coalition, which remains committed to the EU and to multi-racialism. Accordingly, the BNP has to drive this fact home in all future electioneering; it must not allow a few showbiz poseurs to define what real patriotism is about.

A word of warning: it is quite conceivable that, in a further attempt to capture BNP votes, the UKIP may at some point make soothing noises about 'controlling immigration' (*It has already begun to do so. Ed.*); an all-too-familiar refrain of the three main parties. This being so, a 'me-too' response by the BNP is totally inadequate. On the issue of race, the BNP must be unequivocal in promising immediate revocation of the Race Acts and a very substantial repatriation programme. Failing this, its voice will become lost in the electioneering cacophony and the party will find itself effectively upstaged by the UKIP.

Bringing this repatriation policy boldly to the fore is the best way of exposing the fraudulent 'patriotism' of UKIP along with that of other political parties. And the fact that this will generate a great deal of media hostility is ultimately to our advantage; UKIP's much-vaunted 'plain speaking' on Europe will sound increasingly feeble when that party is confronted on the Race Acts and repatriation. Let no one imagine that toning down this basic part of the BNP message could have electoral advantages.

Such media-friendly posturing deceives nobody and it would get no more patriotic votes than it deserves. Indeed, it would almost certainly split the BNP itself.

In conclusion, the signs are that the three main parties are already on the run from the BNP. The main opposition from here on is likely to be a well-financed and stage-managed UKIP with generous media coverage and showbiz endorsement. 'Know your real enemy' remains the first rule of survival.

FRANK KIMBAL JOHNSON
Louth, Lincs.

SIR: Recently I was reading through a government publication dated April 2003, titled 'Pension credit: pick it up. It's yours'. At the end of the booklet it's stated that translations are available in Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Gujarati, Punjabi, Somali, Urdu and Vietnamese.

It could be argued that some of these Asian 'ethnics' have probably been here for many decades, so a translation into Bengali, Chinese, Gujarati, Punjabi and Urdu may be necessary.

But how many Arabs, Somalis and Vietnamese qualify for pension credit?

It could be argued as well that if an immigrant has been here for more than five or ten years his command of the English language should be sufficiently well developed for him not to need translations in his native tongue anyway.

So why bother with translations?

If an immigrant does have a problem with understanding an English-language document it should surely be much quicker and easier for him to approach a fellow-member of his community for a translation.

In fact, we seem to have gone translation crazy in recent years. Colleges and hospitals display notices in every conceivable language. Their administrators seem to take delight in this, perhaps because it proves what a wonderful multi-racial society we live in!

The cost of producing such translations must be heavy and it's time we asked whether they are necessary.

The questions that need to be asked are:-

- How many speakers of any foreign language are there?
- Exactly what do they need to know?
- Can they obtain their translations from members of their own communities?

All government publications are translated into various foreign languages and issued free of charge to anyone who wants them.

Why not introduce a nominal charge for such translations? No doubt, if a future BNP Government tried to restrict or phase out translations of official publications there would be howls of protest about 'human rights' and appeals to the High Court and, eventually the European Court of Human Rights, demanding that there is a need to translate all documents into Swahili, Vietnamese and every other conceivable language.

BNP policy should be not to produce translations unless there is a demand for them from a sufficient number of 'ethnics' and the documents in question contain absolutely essential information.

In this way we can save millions in admin costs.

MATTHEW ARMITAGE
London S.W.9

SIR: According to Tory leader Michael Howard, "the Conservatives hold the middle ground" over EU membership (*Daily Mail*, 2.6.04), with Labour and the Lib-Dems to the 'extreme left' and UKIP to the 'extreme right' (Hush, don't even mention that awful group representing the man in the street called the BNP – 'vile' people, according to the *Mail*).

The Tories, they would have us believe, will not allow the UK to become part of a federal super-state. But, I ask you, where and when have we heard all this before? Mrs. Thatcher (as she was then) hammered away to try and change the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) but nothing changed. That was 20 years ago, when the EU (then the EEC) only ran to a dozen members. So what chance does Mr. Hecht (sorry, Howard) have now, with 25 in the group? Want it in Spanish, Michael? *Nada!*

MIKE ROBINSON
Sharnford, Hinckley, Leics.

SIR: Roseanna Cunningham of the SNP was given space in the *Daily Express* to run down the BNP. She calls the party's members and supporters "pathetic inadequates."

This is one of the members of the Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh who sat and never raised a voice as the price of the Parliament building sky-rocketed to over £500 million. The word 'inadequate' hardly fits these members of the Edinburgh Parliament. *Useless* is more applicable.

The Lib-Lab-Con parties conceded the Scots parliament under threats from terrorist groups like the 'Army of Provisional Government' (APG) and 'Scottish National Liberation Army' (SNLA). They were petrified that an IRA-type war would start up in Scotland.

The first thing they did was rush off to the bankers and borrow an enormous sum of money to erect a building for their white elephant – and it isn't even finished yet. In fact, the final cost could run to a billion!

Like all good socialists, they borrow off the bankers to finance their grandiose schemes and pass on the bill to the taxpayer (not forgetting the interest, of course).

HARRY MULLIN
Glasgow

SIR: I was shocked to see that Nick Griffin employs as one of his henchmen someone who is "one of Britain's most dangerous gangsters." This revelation made me waver before I voted for the BNP but I still did so.

I thought the leadership was claiming to offer the people a better class of politics, but I wonder how many in our movement understand what this means.

CHRISTOPHER HAINES
Ilford, Essex

Down in the old Transvaal...

The pretty 15 year-old puts up her handgun and scrambles to her feet. Target practice is over; time now for prayers, to be followed by dinner. At the end of the second day of a three-day course Laura has learned a lot. She is a European living in a hostile environment; an environment in which 1600 white farmers have been murdered over the decade since bandits seized control of her country with the approval of the 'civilised' world. Unlike many of her contemporaries in the West, this young lady has neither the time nor the need for drugs, binge-drinking, alien 'music', or sexual experimentation. Her first duty, as an Afrikaner, is to her family and her folk, who are being systematically targeted by marauding gangs determined to drive them off the land.

It is likely that both Mandela and his successor Mbeki know just enough about economics to realise that, without its white farmers, South Africa is finished; and yet the Government is unable, or unwilling, to protect them. Not unexpectedly, the descendants of the voortrekkers are making a fight of it, and have formed a security structure linking all the farming families together, where one group responds to help another in a crisis, and where a whole family must operate as a military unit if it is to survive attack. Are these outrages ever discussed at Westminster? Ask your MP what, if anything, is being done!

... and in another world

North Kirklees is a long, long way from the banks of the Limpopo (see above) but the cultural distance is, we would suggest, even greater. Here, in a district of West Yorkshire, a fifth of all 14 year-olds have a tobacco addiction, regularly drink alcohol, and take but little exercise. Ten per cent are having sex every week and half of these do not use any form of contraception. (Some experts believe that as many as one in four teenage girls in our country may have chlamydia, a sexually transmitted disease where most cases show no symptoms, and which can cause male infertility problems). Fewer than 10 per cent ingest sufficient fresh fruit and vegetables to keep them healthy, and a horrifying one in four of these kids can boast 25 per cent tooth decay.

THE WAY WE LIVE NOW

Some observations on contemporary society
by JUNIUS

Only if you have the money

On the subject of dental care, let us look briefly at the cause of all the problems. The miserable cheapskates in charge of the NHS – which means your precious politicians – themselves opted for a two-tier system when they decided that the less wealthy could be fobbed off with the most inexpensive and most antiquated care on the market. An administrator with half a brain would have insisted that all patients should receive the very best and most up-to-date treatment, and that a practitioner could either be NHS or private *but not both*. Under such a régime, there would have been very few private rip-off merchants around, and the Government would have been firmly in control of every aspect of the service, including the cost. Undoubtedly it would have been cheaper to operate and fairer as well.

Sorry! More poetry

*Here malice, rapine, accident, conspire,
And now a rabble rages, now a fire;
Their ambush here relentless ruffians lay,
And here the fell attorney prowls for prey;
Here falling houses thunder on your head,
And here a female atheist talks you dead.*

Such was the youthful Sam Johnson's view of London in 1738. We suppose that, were he to see our capital today, he would be lost for words.

Profile of a war criminal

Octogenarian Professor Bernard Lewis would like to be remembered as an historian, as an academic. Learned, and versed in at least five Middle Eastern languages, he most certainly is, but he can also be identified as "the unofficial author of the Bush doctrine of spreading, by force if necessary,

the 'values and democracy' of the West, part of the justification for the Iraq war." Lewis is an intimate of Vice-President Cheney and has been described by lifelong neo-con hawk Richard Perle as "the single most important intellectual influence countering conventional wisdom on managing the conflict between radical Islam and the West." Astute readers will, by now, have gathered that the professor is a Zionist, and one whose own hawkishness can be traced back to his loathing of appeasement before the Second World War. This peculiar genus of mindset argues: "Why ever did we wait until September 1939 when we could have had the world in flames a full six and a half years earlier? Off to battle chaps! But please don't involve me." As it happens, the 24-year-old Mr. Lewis got himself a cushy job at the Foreign Office between 1941 and 1945 before resuming his studies at London University and later at Princeton, USA. As the 'Coalition's' stooges take 'control' of their country (June 30th), the people of Iraq should realise that the leopard, however beguiling his disguise, never changes his spots.

What are we waiting for?

While the UN fumbles around trying to bring order out of chaos in the streets of Bagh-dad, it is interesting to read that "The Red Cross is to give first aid lessons in one of the most notorious areas for gun crime. Residents in Moss Side and Hulme in Manchester will be taught to treat gunshot wounds in the vital minutes before ambulance crews arrive." We need to regain control of our British streets, whatever it takes. Bring our troops back from the desert and deploy them where they are really needed! The old con-men at Westminster are powerless, and useless, and time is running out.

A time for strength and resolution

Chilling news! London is number three on a hit list of five cities any of which could find themselves hosting the Olympic circus in 2012. Ominous indeed, but all is not lost. On the plus side we learn that our capital city's transport system is lousy (which we knew already), that pollution levels are unacceptable (which we knew already), and that we lack both the experience and the major sporting venues to effectively stage the 'games'.

Already two out of five Londoners do not want 'it' to happen, a proportion which will surely rise when people begin to realise the extent of the cost, misery and disruption which will have to be born. Unbelievably, the big spenders who want to stage this £2½ billion international jamboree in Britain have plans for the Met to create special expressways for the exclusive use of athletes, sponsors and VIPs on London's already seriously overburdened roads, while the rest of us face chaos in the remaining lanes. Aspiring protesters/demonstrators should look across the Channel for a few tips on how to get effectively organised and noticed! The news that Tony Blair is delighted with the short-listing of London provides us with a useful pointer as to how really bad things could get. Even *The Times* is suggesting that we should surrender the 'honour' to Paris. The IOC makes its final selection around a year from now. Let us pray!

Coiffure confusion

"Throughout the years of white oppression, one of the ways in which black men and women were culturally subjugated – though it was by no means the most heinous – was by the insistence that their hair, in a state of nature, was not good enough. It was inferior. It was animal. Only short (or chemically straightened) hair was acceptable to the white-run global style hegemony."
(Professor Gideon Garter in *The Sunday Times*)

How odd then that the so-called 'supermodel' Miss Naomi Campbell seems happy to be photographed with hair straight as a die, and how unfeeling of Lloyds TSB to run a series of advertisements featuring another black lady apparently not yet emancipated.

SPEARHEAD BOOKS

Abolition of Britain, The (Peter Hitchens) £9.95.
The cultural revolution from Lady Chatterley to Tony Blair.

Adrien Arcand (Unknown Author) £5.00. A report of the Kingston Convention and the Massey Hall Rally held in Canada in 1938 by the National Unity Party, led by Adrien Arcand.

Advance to Barbarism (F.J.P. Veale) £13.95. Shows how warfare has degenerated to some of the worst levels in known history.

A.K.Chesterton Memorial Archive, The. £14.45. Three of A.K.'s booklets produced during the 1950s which throw much light on Britain's situation today. A.K. Chesterton's clear exposition of the malevolent malaise affecting Britain, and the solutions required to correct the situation, can be regarded as being the seminal and guiding influence of the National Front, and later, when it was formed, the BNP.

Alien Menace, The (Lt. Col. A.H. Lane) £4.50. Early warnings against immigration. First published 1928.

Alternative, The (Hilaire Belloc) £1.00. An article originally written during Mr Belloc's parliamentary days, for *St. George's Review* and since revised.

Anglo-American Establishment, The (Carroll Quigley) £12.95. A factual appraisal of the realities of power politics and a study of groups that work behind the scenes to influence world events.

Aspects of Anglo Saxon Magic (Bill Griffiths) £14.95. A neat division between mainstream and occult, rational and superstitious, Christian and Pagan, is not always easy to discern. The Church outlawed practices considered evil, like divination, folk healing and spells, while at the same time adopting similar rituals itself.

Barnes Review, The (sample copy) £5.50. A well produced US revisionist history magazine covering a range of topics from ancient to modern.

Bell Curve, The (Richard J. Herrnstein and Charles Murray) £19.95. Breaks new ground and old taboos! Describes the deliberate creation, of a new underclass, with racial connotations.


Bible and Race, The (Capt. Kenneth McKilliam) £1.50. A little booklet to enable clerics and others to understand the Bible and its racial message.

Biology of the Race Problem (Professor W. George) £3.30. A comprehensive introduction to racial differences with indisputable scientific data.

Blackshirts on Sea (J.A. Booker) £19.50. A pictorial record of the British Union pre-war summer camps with comprehensive text.

Blind Watchmaker (Richard Dawkins) £10.00. Described in *The Good Book Guide* by Dr. John Gribbin as possibly the most important work on evolution since that by Charles Darwin.

Blowing the Whistle (Paul van Buitenen) £12.99. One man's fight against fraud within the



The prices given here include postal charges for dispatch within the British Isles. For postage overseas please enquire before ordering.

Payments should be made to 'Spearhead Books' and sent to the above address.

Spearhead Books handles works by numerous and varied independent authors. It should not need stating that the publisher of Spearhead may not necessarily endorse all the contents of these works.

European Commission.

Break His Bones (Bradley R. Smith) £13.00. Reveals the systematic attempts at the suppression of historical revisionism in the USA.

British Peace and How to Get it, The (Sir Oswald Mosley) £4.00. A proposal for a negotiated peace in 1940 with Empire intact and people safe.

British Press, The ('Boreas') £2.75. Although this was published in 1939, readers will spot an uncanny similarity with the situation in Britain today.

Cambridge Spies, The (Verne W. Newton) £18.00. The untold story of the traitors MacLean, Philby and Burgess and their activities in the USA.

Camp of the Saints, The (Jean Raspail) £9.00. A work of fiction that has almost come true: the overwhelming and destruction of Europe by immigrants from the Third World.

Captive State (George Monbiot) £15.95. The corporate take over of Britain today is revealed.

Case for David Irving, The (Nigel Jackson) £13.75. An exposure of the selective censorship of history and freedom of speech which proceeds at our peril.

Conquest Through Immigration (George W. Robnett) £13.00. How Zionism turned Palestine into a Jewish state.

Creed of Iron (Ron McVan) £9.50. The 14-Word Press endeavours to bring Wotanist art, history, poetry, wisdom and inspiration to a wider audience.

Deadlier than the H-Bomb (Wing Cdr. Leonard Young) £8.50. An Exposure of Sovietisation by Stealth.

Deceived, Damned and Defiant (David Lane) £14.25. Sentenced to 190 years incarceration, Mr. Lane is one of the best known white political prisoners in the world today. His revolutionary writings are presented with many beautiful illustrations. Undaunted by his plight, unshakable in his convictions, David Lane has emerged as an insurgent icon of a turbulent age.

Diamond in the Dust (by his political colleagues) £10.00. 100pp plus 4pp colour. An appreciation of Ian Stuart, his life and work.

Did Six Million Really Die? (Richard Harwood) £2.50. Controversial and yet good news for all victims and students of the 'Holocaust'.

Dilemma of Inter-racial Relations, The (Prof. Gayre of Gayre) £4.00. An analysis of the problems of forcing different races together, and the results of the efforts of compulsion.


**PO Box 2471, Hove,
East Sussex BN3 4DT**

Do we Need Mass Immigration? (Anthony Browne) £6.00. All the reasons why immigration by the teeming masses of the Third World is bad for Britain.

Empire of the City (E.C. Knuth) £11.25. An examination of the role of the international élite, based in the city of London, in advancing globalisation.

Enemy of Europe (Francis Parker Yockey and Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £10.75. Given here is the view of the 'European Situation' by the man who was hailed by many people as America's greatest post-war philosopher. Comment and analyses by Prof. Revilo P. Oliver, who has written many incisive works on current racial and social problems.

English Warrior, The (Stephen Pollington) £16.75. An attempt to get beneath the surface of Anglo-Saxon warriorhood and to investigate the rites, social attitudes, mentality and mythology of the warfare of its times.



Evil Good Men Do, The (Jeffrey Hamm) £10.00. About decisions by governments that have led to the ruin of Britain.

Falsehood in Wartime (Arthur Ponsonby MP) £10.00. Propaganda lies of the First World War exposed.

Fatima and the Great Conspiracy (Deirdre Manifold) £10.75. An attempt to explain the meaning and truth behind the vision.

For My Legionaries (Corneliu Zelea Codreanu) £12.00. The story of the life of Rumania's greatest nationalist leader and his struggle to bring justice to his people.

French Revolution, The (Nesta Webster) £19.00. An excellent historical account, with descriptions of the horrors that set the scene for the more terrible events of the communist revolts in other parts of the world.

Gruesome Harvest (Ralph Franklin Keeling) £11.95. How Allied policy makers treated their defeated foe. A compelling story of 'victors justice'.

Guernsey Experiment, The (Olive and Jan Grubiak) £3.75. How the Government of Guernsey raised funds by issuing its own currency without interest.

Guild Alternative, The (Arthur Penty) £3.75. An answer to the chaos of the modern world based on traditional Christian social teaching.

History of World Revolution, The (The Duke of Northumberland) £4.50. The author was also the publisher of *The Patriot* weekly newspaper, and he employed as his chief writer Nesta Webster, the famous conspiracy theorist.

Hoax of the 20th Century, The (Prof. A.R. Butz) £15.00. The most famous, and indeed seminal, work, on 'Holocaust' revisionism.

Holocaust, The: 120 Questions Answered (Charles Weber) £2.00. Fact and fable examined

and questioned.

Innocent at Dachau (Joseph Halow) £16.95. An eye-witness account by a court reporter.

Iron Curtain Over America (John Beaty) £7.50. The long story about the epic struggle between Asia and Europe, from the Teutonic Knights to the Communist nuclear spies.

Iron Maze (Gordon Brook-Shepherd) £7.99. About the link between the Western secret services and the Bolsheviks.

Jewish Supremacism (David Duke) £18.00 A detailed study of how the future of the world lies in the hands of this enigmatic people.



King Arthur's Place in Pre-History (W.A. Cummins) £10.95. A legend traced back to the Bronze Age, possibly linked to Stonehenge and the early Wessex culture.

Land Rights and Birth Rights (Peter B. English) £12.00. The great Australian hoax. An examination of the rights to ownership of former aboriginal land.

Legacy of John Lennon, The (David A. Noebel) £10.00. About the charming or harming of a generation.

Letters of T.E. Lawrence, The (Edited by M. Brown) £9.25. An essential book for Lawrence enthusiasts.

Leuchter Report, The (Fred Leuchter) £4.50. A professional forensic examination of the alleged 'gas chambers' at Auschwitz.

Looking for the Lost Gods of England (Kathleen Herbert) £4.95. The tales, beliefs and traditions of ancient times are still with us and are able to stir our minds and imaginations.

Lord of the Rings (J.R.R. Tolkien) £16.75. A novel based on British folklore describing a mythical world and the battle between good and evil.

Macpherson Report, The (Dr. Frank Ellis) £4.50. About the hysteria from the legal establishment over the breakdown of the multi-racial society.

Mau Mau Oaths (A.K. Chesterton) £3.30. Evidence of the unbelievably barbaric and inhuman initiation ceremonies of this so-called gang of 'Freedom Fighters'.

Me Gibson and the Pharisees (Ed. Kerry Bolton) £4.50. The tribulations of a producer who tried to make a film (*The Passion*) with an accurate portrayal of the death of Christ.

Mosley's Blackshirt Airmen (Keith Thompson) £3.00. About aircraft-makers, airmen and war heroes.

Murder (Frank Schmidt) £2.75. The dreadful story of the almost complete extermination of the Swabian and Danube Germans after the Second World War.

Music in the Third Reich (A.V. Schaffenberg) £2.50. Fascinating history of blossoming talent.

My Banned Holocaust Interview (Carlo Mattogno) £6.50. A leading Italian history revisionist had his studies and conclusions banned. This is his work published privately.

Norse Poems (W.H. Auden and P.B. Taylor) £7.60. Old Icelandic poems translated to capture the rhythmic quality of the originals.

Open Sesame (B.E. Biggs) £1.50. Poetry from a stalwart patriot.

Origins of the Second World War (A.J.P. Taylor) £9.75. The classic work by this most respected historian, which began the trend towards revising many previously held views on the causes of World War II.

Our Financial Masters (A. Raven Thompson) £3.90. A pre-war look at finance and the reason why it must be controlled.

Party System, The (Hilaire Belloc and Cecil Chesterton) £4.00. A critique of the fraudulent parliamentary system. First written in 1911, this edition has a preface by Aidan Mackey.

Pawns in the Game (William Guy Carr) £14.95. A classic conspiracy exposé.

Perkin Warbeck Conspiracy, The (Ian Arthurson) £10.95. Warbeck claimed to be one of the Princes murdered in the Tower of London. He was used by those in power and came close to changing the course of European history.

Plagiarism and the Culture War (Theodore Papas) £14.95. The writings of Martin Luther King Jr. and other prominent Americans.

Policeman's Narrative, A (Henry A. Clark) £7.00. About witchcraft and murder in Zimbabwe.

Prodigal Genius (John J. O'Neill) £18.50. The life of Nikola Tesla, the great inventor whom history forgot.

Real Cheats and Fraudsters, The (E. Morgan) £2.75. How governments fleece the people out of their hard-earned cash.

Rebirth of England and English (Fr. Andrew Phillips) £4.95. The vision of the Dorset poet William Barnes (1801-1886). In search of our post-industrial age, the folk nationalist will learn much from this book.

Rebuilding Russia (Alexander Solzenitsyn) £8.00. Reflections and proposals from this talented and extraordinary man.

Recovery (Kerry Bolton) £2.30. The story of Gottfried Feder and how Germany broke out of the economic recession of the early 1930s.

Rising Tide of Colour, The (Lothrop Stoddard) £7.25. The growing demographic threat to white survival. A very relevant warning for the present generation.

Second World War in Photographs, The (Imperial War Museum) £21.95. A large-format book by world-famous photographers.

Secret Societies and Subversive Movements (Nesta Webster) £17.95. Argues the case for suspecting a secret directing influence behind most major political convulsions.

Silver Saga, The (Fiona A. Philpott) £8.95. Beautifully illustrated in colour, this book is a study of the arts and crafts of the Vikings. It concentrates upon the Viking treasures found in the North and West of Britain.

Stalin's War of Extermination 1941-45 (Joachim Hoffman) £30.00. This book details the German Army's desperate attempt to frustrate Soviet plans to subjugate Europe.

Struggle for World Power, The (George Knupffer) £9.95. About the bid for global control by the faceless men of the secret world-government.

Talmud Unmasked, The (Revd. I.B. Pranaitis) £11.00. This much talked-of Jewish book researched and translated as a useful tool in the understanding of modern Jewish aspirations.

Tastes of Anglo-Saxon England (Mary Savelli) £4.95. 46 recipes that will enable you to enjoy flavours widely known in Anglo-Saxon England but rarely experienced today.

Tomb of English People, The (Duncan Balmer) £8.70. This new book gives a concise history of England and contemptuously spurns political correctness. As the author points out, the graves of our ancestors may be found all over the Earth, but our influence remains.

Traditionalist's Anthology (Elizabeth Freeman) £3.95. The Editor's choice is a key to a collection of gems so excellent in themselves that they "Make hungry where most (they) satisfy."

Twins – Black and White (R. Travis Osborne) £14.95. A detailed study of 496 pairs of black and white twins, ranging in age from 12 to 20, with the results.

Tyr: Myth, Culture, Tradition (J. Buckley, C. Cleary and M. Moynihan) £12.50. A publication that celebrates the traditional myths, cultures and social institutions of pre-Christian, pre-modern Europe. It stands for radical traditionalism, rejecting the materialist code of 'quantity over quality'.



Vikings (J. Wooding) £8.95. About the lives, history, mythology and influence of our Norse ancestors.

Warburg and the Kalergi Plan (Capt. A. Rogers OBE) £3.90. World Government through European Union and racial mixing has long been the dream of the powerful forces that control governments. Here this once senior officer in British military intelligence gives the result of his diligent research.

Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt (Frederick Soddy) £6.75. An explanation of how money can become the servant of mankind instead of its master.

Western Intelligentsia and the Soviet Union (D. Heald) £2.50. A selection of quotes praising Stalin and the Red dictatorships in Eastern Europe by a range of liberal intellectuals. These are the words that their authors want forgotten.

World Conquerors, The (Louis Marschalko) £16.95. A great mine of historical detail that explains much of what brought European civilisation to death and destruction. A period that the author describes as "The Second Feast of Purim."

Yesterday and Tomorrow £4.50. Essays by various nationalist authors. About the tradition of National Revolution.

Your National Identity (Capt. Kenneth McKilliam) £2.50. A Christian view of nationalism and identity. Contains maps, regalia and emblems.

Zionist Factor, The (Ivor Benson) £12.95. Developments in the Middle East which threaten to draw all mankind into the catastrophe of another world war make it more urgently necessary than ever before to explore Zionism as one of the major forces shaping our world.

Plus four councillors – it could have been more

Despite a considerable amount of electoral fraud committed against the BNP, with ballot papers not delivered and election leaflets 'lost' by the postal services, the party's candidates in the local government elections on June 10th significantly increased their overall share of the vote. With 313 candidates standing (a record), the party lost some seats and gained some. In fact the seats gained amounted to four more than those lost. Most party supporters will agree that far more could have been gained, and fewer lost, had the party given higher priority to the council elections and less to the Euro Elections (see our analysis elsewhere). With these factors taken into account, the council results were very praiseworthy and reflect a lot of credit on local candidates and campaigners.

The highlights, with the candidates' names, were:-

BRADFORD CITY COUNCIL

Keighley West: Angela Clarke 14.5 per cent; **Wibsey:** Arthur Redfearn 13 per cent; **Worth Valley:** Christopher Kirby 11.8 per cent; **Wyke:** James Lewthwaite 14.1 per cent.

All elected in triple-candidate vote.

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

Loughton Alderton: Terence Farr 27.9 per cent; **Loughton Broadway:** Thomas Richardson 33.6 per cent; **Loughton Fairmead:** Patricia Richardson 26.6 per cent.

All elected.

BURNLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Briercliffe: David Thomson 27.8 per cent; **Brunshaw:** Michael Pound 22.1 per cent; **Cliviger with Worsthorne:** David Shapcott 25.2 per cent; **Coalclough with Deerplay:** Mark Pennington 20.5 per cent; **Gannow:** John Cave 29.1 per cent; **Hapton with Park:** Sharon Wilkinson 29.6 per cent (elected); **Rosegrove:** Derek Dawson 36.6 per cent; **Rosehill:** Gregory Marshall 20.5 per cent;

The BNP averaged 26.4 per cent over the seats it fought, and every BNP candidate came first or second.

STOKE CITY COUNCIL

Abbey Green: John West 24.8 per cent; **Blurton:** Steven Hallam 26.0 per cent; **East Valley:** Allan Eaton 25.3 per cent; **Fenton:** Mark Platt 25.8 per cent; **Longton North:** Mark Leat 35.1 per cent (elected); **Meir**

Park: Michael Coleman 24.4 per cent; **Norton & Braeley:** Barry Cuthbertson 32.8 per cent; **Weston:** Ian Clegg 29.9 per cent.

The BNP share of the vote here was most impressive, with the 24.4 per cent in Meir Park the lowest among eight seats contested.

Around the rest of the country, the party's percentages of the vote were up on previous ones, and in many areas BNP candidates very narrowly missed getting elected to councils.

The Eleventh Hour

The Eleventh Hour has been described as the 'Bible' of the British National Party. First published in 1988, the latest (1998) edition has been updated to take in the many new developments on the political scene occurring since. Written by the founder of the British National Party, John Tyndall, the book gives comprehensive coverage of all the major current issues affecting Britain. It delves into the ideologies of liberalism, conservatism and the left, and also examines that of British Nationalism and its background. It contains extensive analyses of the British economy and political system. It looks at issues connected with freedom and order, the mass media, the environment, race and immigration, Northern Ireland, the Commonwealth, foreign policy and defence. It also gives a detailed outline of the development of the BNP and its predecessor organisations in Britain.

The Eleventh Hour runs to 537 pages. It is partly autobiographical, giving an account of the author's origins, early political awakening and subsequent life's work.

Price: Hardback £25.00 plus £4.78 p&p; softback £17.50 plus £3.45 p&p. Please make out cheques to Albion Press and send to PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT.

How to obtain Spearhead

Make sure of your regular copy of Spearhead by becoming a subscriber. Please fill in the form here and send it to us, together with payment, as directed. Please note also the rates for bulk-buyers.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

ENCLOSED SUBSCRIPTION OF.....

PLUS DONATION (IF ANY) OF.....

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick box where applicable):-

British Isles £24.00□; Overseas surface mail £27.00□; Air mail Europe £29.20□; Air mail elsewhere £35.60□.


PLEASE NOTE: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling. If remittance is in any other currency, an additional charge of £5.50 is required in the case of cheques and money orders and £2.50 in the case of banknotes, these paying for banker's commission and charges.

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:-

10-19 copies £1.10 each; 20-49 copies £1.00 each; 50-99 copies 83p each; 100-199 copies 69p each; 200-499 copies 60p each; 500 copies 55p each. For advice on postal rates for these quantities please contact our office.

All cheques and postal or money orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT. Please do not include payment for *Spearhead* in a remittance which includes payment for other items.

JOHN TYNDALL



The book you must read if you want to find out what John Tyndall and the BNP stand for

Elections to European Parliament, June 2004

THE BAD NEWS AND THE GOOD NEWS

BNP fails to win a seat but votes very encouraging

THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY failed in its quest to win seats in the European Parliament in the elections on June 10th. This was after a campaign in which the party had raised, by its own standards, an unprecedented sum of money and made an enormous investment of effort at both national leader-

view to heading off the challenge of the BNP. The results in 1999, however, when UKIP won three Euro seats and the BNP none, should have sounded a warning to the latter as to what the odds would be, and this warning clearly was not heeded.

It was confidently predicted by the BNP leadership that the party would win four or five seats in Europe, and that this would result in a huge financial bonanza by way of its elected MEPs making over portions of their Euro salaries to party funds. In the outcome, our party will not benefit here to the tune of a single penny.

The region targeted as the one where the BNP would stand the best chance of getting an MEP elected was the North West of England, and the number-one candidate chosen to contest this region was party chairman Nick Griffin. As things turned out, the best results were obtained in Yorkshire & the Humber, where the BNP won 126,538 votes – an impressive 8.0 per cent of the poll. In the West Midlands 107,794 votes (7.5 per cent) were chalked up and in the East Midlands 91,860 (6.5 per cent), while the North East and North West scored equally with 6.4 per cent each, aggregate votes being 50,249 and 134,958 respectively.

Though the overall results were disappointing in terms of candidates not elected, these votes, together with others achieved elsewhere (full details at top right of this page), were impressive. Without the intervention of UKIP, who won 20 seats nationwide, the BNP would almost certainly have sent some MEPs to Europe. As it is, the party can take much heart from the fact that 808,200 people all over mainland Britain put their crosses beside it on their ballot papers – a fact that did not escape the notice of its opponents, who found the phenomenon extremely worrying. This augurs most promis-

EURO ELECTION RESULTS

REGION	VOTES	%
South West	43,653	3.0
South East	64,877	2.9
London	76,152	4.0
Eastern	65,557	4.3
East Midlands	91,860	6.5
West Midlands	107,794	7.5
Wales	27,135	3.0
North West	134,958	6.4
Yorks. & Humber	126,538	8.0
North East	50,249	6.4
Scotland	19,427	1.7


ingly for the future. The tide in Britain is flowing in favour of nationalism – as the big vote for UKIP also underlined. The BNP can become part of that tide if it corrects the glaring faults in the party that led to the disappointments of June 10th.

One question to end with: Whoever designed the BNP's main Euro Election leaflet? It said so little about the EU that the electorate could have been forgiven for not knowing where it stood on the issue!



Poster used in Euro Election campaigns

ship level and in the regions and branches. With the Euro elections falling on the same day as the elections to local government in England and Wales, the BNP was faced with a quite impossible commitment of resources if it were to do justice to both. A decision needed to be made as to which took priority, and in the event the decision was the wrong one. Top priority was given to the Euros, and in consequence the effort in local government elections inevitably suffered. In an article on pages 6 and 7 of this issue, our editor analyses the campaigns and results in the respective elections, and offers some opinions as to why a big mistake was made in putting the Euro Elections a long way first. The BNP was always going to fight at a considerable disadvantage in these elections in relation to the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP). How much of a disadvantage could not have been foreseen when the decision over priorities was made; the UKIP surge in the last two or three months surprised everyone, and was probably encouraged by the media specifically with a



BNP List for the YORKSHIRE Euro-Constituency

Nick Cass, seen with his family on this poster, was the No. 1 BNP candidate in the Yorkshire & Humber region, where the party achieved its highest percentages of the poll.

SPEARHEAD SUPPORT FUND


Income from the sales of our magazine is not enough to cover full production and administrative costs. We therefore rely on regular donations from our supporters so that we may remain solvent,

Also, because of the controversial nature of the opinions expressed in these columns, it is impossible to induce wholesale distributors to handle the magazine. Hence another need for additional financial support.

Please send all contributions to *Spearhead*, PO Box 2471, Hove, East Sussex BN3 4DT. Please note that receipts are not normally sent for donations of less than £10 unless specifically requested – in which case an SAE would be appreciated. Thanks.

London: no seats but deposits saved!

The British National Party suffered disappointment in the elections in London last month, getting no candidates elected to the Greater London Authority nor any to the European Parliament. Nevertheless, the party did manage to save deposits in each case. Here the party's London agent Bob Gertner is seen holding the two cheques representing deposits returned.



THE United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) has burst into national prominence as a result of last month's Euro Elections – with generous help, it will have been observed, from the mass media. Only simpletons imagine that this could have happened had UKIP been anything other than a bogus nationalist party, set up to divert support away from the genuine article – meaning of course the BNP.

Attention has already been drawn to UKIP's lack of any firm commitment to tackle Britain's race issue – beyond a half-baked pledge to introduce firmer immigration 'controls' than have so far been forthcoming from the Labour Government – controls which, presumably, would apply to Australians and South Africans of British descent just as much as to Kosovans, Iranians and Somalis!

Of less prominence, but nonetheless of

JEFFREY TURNER asks...

How nationalist is UKIP?

great importance, is UKIP's policy of 'free trade' between Britain and the nations presently comprising the EU following our withdrawal from that body. This policy was given loud emphasis by UKIP spokesman Robert Kilroy-Silk in numerous interviews before and after last month's election triumph for his party.

In fact, free trade has proved an economic disaster to Britain, as well as running contrary to all principles of nationalism. A sovereign nation-state must have the right and freedom to protect its vital industries against foreign competition whenever and wherever it judges that protection to be

ANOTHER PRINTER'S HOWLER

Once again, we must apologise to our readers for a glaring printer's error in last month's issue. This occurred on page eight, at the top of our editor's article 'Toryism or nationalism?'. Preceding this was a heading which was supposed to read: 'John Tyndall looks at the options in Britain's crisis'. This piece was set correctly in our office and read as such in the disk delivered to the printer. However, in the process of its being copied at the printer's end the word 'crisis' was somehow lost, so that the heading made no sense whatsoever. We find these 'howlers' acutely embarrassing, as we try at all times to maintain good standards. Regrettably, we cannot help it when these standards are not achieved elsewhere.

REMINDER

Once again, we must remind readers that press cuttings are normally of little use if they relate to news that is 'dated' by the time Spearhead goes to print.

required. Free trade is not a nationalist, nor even a Conservative, idea; it is a liberal one, and it assumes a global economic community in which nations sacrifice their own special national interests on the altar of some abstract ideal – just as they do now in the European Union from which UKIP claims to seek to rescue us.

Yet Mr. Kilroy-Silk, presumably speaking in line with official UKIP policy, fended off questions about loss of trade in the event of our leaving the EU by saying that we would continue trading with our European partners just as before. What he ought to have done is remind questioners that from the beginning of Britain's membership those partners have sold much more to us than we have to them. By getting out we could restore the balance of our trade and revive the industries that have been ruined inside the EU – but only by protection!

MEETING

Bradford

Sunday, July 11th, starting at 2.00 p.m.

Theme:-

'Nationalism: where do we go from here?'

Speakers will include:-

EDDY MORRISON; JOHN WOOD; JOHN TYNDALL

Assembly point for redirection will be given to nationalists in the North of England by special circular. Any-one not receiving such a circular but wishing to attend should ring 07817 927455 for details.

This meeting is being organised and promoted by the Spearhead Support Group